# BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VI. PHILADELPHIA, JANUARY, 1851. No. 1.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,

AT 198 MARSHALL STREET, THIRD DOOR ABOVE BROWN,

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, one dollar; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; ALWAYS IN ADVANCE.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

## THE TRUE SOURCE OF IMMORTALITY.

BY THOMAS READ, NEW YORK.

[Continued from page 183, Vol. V.]

### WHAT IS THE PENALTY OF THE LAW?

To fit man to hold the elevated position designed for him by his Creator, and to enable him to act well his part in every emergency, *he must have a moral character*. What is a man without a moral character? Can he safely wield the mighty energies wherewith God has endowed him? Will he not abuse his powers, infringe on the rights of others, and thereby frustrate the gracious designs of his Maker? He must be restrained by moral principle; he must be master of himself; he must learn to obey, and to govern; he must contribute towards the elevation of his species; and he must combine with his fellows for the diffusion of universal good.

And if natural laws are necessary for the government of the inanimate and material universe, how much more necessary are moral laws, for the government of free moral intelligences. Where there are good laws, and where the laws are cheerfully obeyed, *there* is LIBERTY. And where laws are not, or are not rigidly enforced, where every man does what is right in his own eyes, there will be confusion and every evil work. And as good laws are equitable, and intended for the good of the governed, therefore the Law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good. Hence God has wisely determined that he will have a tried people, that their moral characters might be developed and established.

1 Pet. 3: 12.—"Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial which is to try you as though some strange thing happened unto you." Thus God tried Abraham, thus he tried Job, thus he tried Adam, and thus he tries all men. And so,

"Out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every thing that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food: the TREE OF LIFE also in the midst of the garden, and the *tree of knowledge of good and evil.*" —Gen. 2: 9.

"And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, *thou shalt not eat of it:*" And if law is good, a fixed penalty is necessary to secure it from violation, which penalty should be inflexibly inflicted upon the transgressor; and so it is added, "for in the day that thou eatest thereof THOU *shalt surely die;* or, *dying* THOU *shalt die.*"

Now Adam, constituted as he was from the dust of the ground, would have died by the operation of the natural laws of his being, if God had not placed the TREE OF LIFE within his reach, by which he could perpetually restore his wasting faculties. Adam had no doubt seen some of the inferior creatures dead, and therefore he must have fully comprehended the nature of the penalty. His very name is evidence that he understood his earthly origin, and the mortality of his nature. How could he understand the penalty of the law to be as some theologians have interpreted it? As 1. Temporal death; 2. Spiritual death; and 3. Eternal death. He must have understood it as death, the suspension of life and consciousness; the dissolution of his fearfully and wonderfully wrought frame into its original elements. To say it was spiritual death, is to confound the crime with the penalty; and to threaten, if you sin, you shall surely become a sinner. It represents the God that hateth sin, as inflicting sin, by his own act, for the punishment of sin. It is confessed that it would have been eternal death, but for the intervention of the atonement, and through it, of the resurrection.

Again, Christ did not die a spiritual death, nor an eternal death; and if the penalty of the law is spiritual death, and eternal death, then Christ did not suffer the penalty of the law; consequently if these penalties were the true ones, there has been no atonement, and "*ye are yet in your sins.*" Thus then there can be no mistake as to the nature of the punishment that was afterwards inflicted. A few cases are cited to show the meaning that Moses and the Prophets attach to this phrase, "thou shalt surely die;" for more, you may consult a concordance. King Saul told Abimelech, the priest, "'*thou shalt surely die,*' thou and all thy father's house." Doeg executed this sentence, "and slew fourscore and five persons that wore a linen ephod." Surely it was not a *moral death* that they died.

Solomon told Shimei, who had cursed his father David, that if he went out of Jerusalem *he should 'surely die.'* Shimei disobeyed; Solomon questioned him, whether he had not clearly stated that *he should 'surely die,'* on the day he should leave Jerusalem. And Benaiah then "fell upon Shimei that he died." A literal death, certainly.

When I say unto the wicked '*Thou shalt surely die.*' If this means spiritual death or moral death it may read thus: When I say unto the wicked [that is, to the morally dead,] thou shalt surely die [a moral death.] This would be contradictory, because the wicked are already morally dead.

See Ezekiel 33: 8, 14; Jer. 26: 8; 1 Saml. 14: 39, 44; Gen. 20: 7.

The death threatened was certainly the suspension of life and consciousness. The entire death of

the MAN. God said, For in the day that thou eatest thereof, 'THOU *shalt surely die*;' or *dying* THOU *shalt die*. And the serpent said unto the woman, *ye shall* NOT *surely die*.

And most of the interpreters of the scriptures say with the serpent, that the essential part of man's nature, the *soul*, being "IMMORTAL," "CANNOT" and "*does not die*:" Thus *practically* agreeing with the serpent.

The woman . . . . took of the fruit thereof and did eat, and gave also to her husband with her, and he did eat.

Unto Adam [God] said. Because thou hast . . . . eaten of the tree . . . . cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life . . . . in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till *thou return unto the ground;* for *out* of *it wast thou* taken: *dust* THOU *art* and *unto dust* shalt THOU *return*. *Thou*, the sinner that sinned, the same THOU, was condemned to toil, and sorrow, and death.

And the Lord God said *lest* he put forth his hand, and take also of the *tree of life*, and EAT, and LIVE FOR EVER: . . . *so he drove out the man*.—See Gen. 3: 4, 6, 17, 19, 22.

*In that very day*, toil and sorrow, and death became his portion, and the portion of his posterity. And the full penalty of the law began immediately to be executed, and DYING HE BEGAN TO DIE, toil and sorrow began to wear out the energies of his life, till finally he returned to the ground, out of which he was taken. Thus God executed the penalty on that very day, by *depriving him of access* to the TREE OF LIFE. God said he should *die*, and Moses wrote that he *died*. He ceased altogether to have a conscious existence, and so death passed upon all mankind; and unless there be a resurrection, *they all have perished*. That is, if there is NO RESURRECTION, there is NO FUTURE LIFE. It is utterly contradictory and impossible to suppose that the soul, or life, the essential attribute of man's nature—*the sole transgressor—escapes*, while the full penalty is poured out upon what would be, upon the common theory, the unoffending body. As well punish the sword of the murderer, instead of the man that wielded it.

*Man was dependent upon his access to the tree of Life for the perpetuity of his existence*, and God in *mercy* debarred him this access, that he might *not* become immortal in sin and misery.

How simple, how forcible if taken literally, but how contradictory and how incomprehensible, if we attempt to interpret this solemn and deeply interesting transaction in accordance with the too prevalent notion of man's NATURAL immortality.

When he drove out the man, God immediately placed at the east of the garden of Eden, Cherubim, and a [flame, folding on itself] to keep the way of the tree of life.—Gen. 3: 24.

To keep—to preserve the way to the tree of life. Supposing the flame, as in Ezekiel's vision, to be the symbol of the Divine presence, and the Cherubim to direct them, that the way of access to the TREE OF LIFE, from which they were debarred by sin, was hereafter to be accessible ONLY through sacrifice, and though they must suffer the extreme penalty of the violated and otherwise dishonored law, the dissolution of their whole being into their original elements; yet, through faith in the atoning sacrifice, and becoming partakers of the divine nature, they might attain unto the resurrection of the just, and THEN they would have free access to the *Tree of Life*, transplanted from an earth polluted by sin, to the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness, and *eat* and LIVE FOR EVER.

Thus the sentence "DYING THOU SHALT DIE," was fully carried out, and "the law honored;" for their faculties began naturally to decay; but, being covered, that is *atoned for*, by the skins of the beasts slain in sacrifice, a symbol of *the sacrifice* to come, they lived a sufficient length of time to secure an eternal inheritance at the resurrection of the dead.

The TREE OF LIFE in Eden; the Tree of Life in the Paradise of God; and the BREAD OF LIFE, which came down from Heaven, which Christ gave "*for the Life of the world*," which if any "man eat thereof *he shall live forever*," are all related to each other; and so long as we have direct access to these, we are immortal and *no longer*. So that our eternal existence will always be dependent upon God, and continued by *favor*, and will *not* be dependent upon any inherent principle that God has *unconditionally* imparted to us. God probably never has made, and never will make a spirit, having an existence independently of Himself.

### AN ARGUMENT AGAINST THE NATURAL IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL DRAWN FROM THE ANALOGY OF THE DEATH OF CHRIST.

There is one death recorded in the Scriptures with considerable minuteness, in consequence of its transcendent importance: the sacrificial death of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. It was prophesied of Christ that he should suffer for our sins, to redeem us from the power of death, the very same penalty as that to which man has made himself liable; which, as has been before shown, consisted in death, the entire suspension of life and consciousness. "For God laid upon him the iniquity of us all" And if God, by Christ, had not interfered with the remedial system, there would have been no resurrection, and if NO RESURRECTION, NO FUTURE LIFE. The whole race of man, as they successively died, would have been entirely blotted out of existence.

But the love of God, which is the source of his justice, has so arranged this remedial system as not to interfere with the infliction of the *full penalty* of his violated law upon the transgressor: thereby establishing his justice and his truth, and affording no impunity to transgression, and no imputation on the goodness, mercy, nor justice of God.

Perfectly analogous to this are the cases in which men break the fixed physical laws of their being. A man ruins his constitution by licentiousness, or intemperance; God, for Christ's sake, forgives him his sins, but he absolves him not from the consequences of his sins, in the present world, but his shattered constitution is a source of sorrow to him as long as he lives; and its evil effects hurry him to the grave. Whosoever has sown to the flesh, though he be forgiven and received into the favor of God, and made an *heir* of life and glory, yet he, assuredly, of the flesh will reap corruption; though his spirit or life will be saved in the day of the Lord; therefore every sin receives its just recompense of reward. The atonement then, does not relieve us from the penalty already incurred, but prevents the accumulation of that penalty by saving us, through faith, from our sins, and buys us back again from the dark dominion of death, to everlasting life, by a resurrection from the dead. Thus the wages of sin

is death; but the gift of God is eternal life, *through Jesus Christ our Lord*, to all them that believe and obey the gospel. And "this is the will of him that sent me, that every one that seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have *everlasting life*: and I will raise him up at the last day."

"Whoso eateth my *flesh* and drinketh my *blood*, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day." "I am the *Resurrection* and the *Life*." See John 6th and 11th.

"I will ransom them from the power of the grave." Hosea 13: 14.

To say that Christ ransomed his people from death and the power of death, if mankind do not wholly die, and if their spirits remain conscious, is alike contradictory to the scriptures and to reason. But Christ did suffer the same penalty as the transgressor, which was death. One transgressor being placed on his right hand and one on his left, and thus Christ "was numbered with the transgressors," and the kind of death he suffered, they suffered; and the scriptures are sufficiently plain as to the nature of the death of Christ. That his soul, as well as his body, was made an offering for sin, and that his spirit of life was yielded up to the care of his Father. Toil and sorrow were superadded to death; therefore was Christ weary, and became a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief, and at one time had not where to lay his head.

Christ then endured the same penalty as man endures. But Christ did not die a *spiritual*, or *moral* death; he was not alienated from God, nor his soul contaminated with sin. Neither did he die an *eternal* death, the suspension of all consciousness.

So then neither *spiritual* death, nor *eternal* death was the penalty, nor a *part* of the penalty of the law to which man is subjected, and which Christ endured; but *death*, LITERAL DEATH, the cessation of being. For the scriptures positively assure us that CHRIST *died and was buried*, that the HOLY ONE was *laid in the grave*, though he saw no corruption.

He poured out his SOUL unto *death*.

His SOUL was made an *offering* for sin.—Isa. 53: 10, 12.

His SOUL was not *left* in Hades, (the state of the dead,) but HE *was raised from the dead*.—Psa. 16: 10; Acts 2: 27.

"And if we believe that JESUS DIED and rose again, *even so*," (in the same manner,) "those also which sleep in Jesus," [are entirely unconscious,] "will God bring with him, [from the grave,] .... at the coming of the Lord."—1 Thess. 4: 13—16.

This text proves that Christ died as we die. If Christ did not die as we die; did not suffer the whole penalty of the law; if all that constituted the Christ did not cease to live, did not become wholly unconscious, and if HE did not rise again FROM THE DEAD—not from a state of partial life—then has no atonement been made, we are not bought with a [stipulated] price, no ransom has been found, we are not redeemed from death, we are yet in our sins, and under the original sentence of condemnation to death; and consequently, "those that have fallen asleep in Christ HAVE PERISHED." 1 Corth. 15: 18.

But our Saviour says, I lay down my LIFE for the sheep. Not his body, merely, but his life. Christ gave HIMSELF, and whatever constituted himself, was subjected to death. "But Christ being risen from the dead, dieth no more, *death hath no more dominion over him*."—Rom. 6: 9.

Then he once wholly died, and death had once dominion over him, most assurely over his soul, and and over all that once lived.

"I am *he that liveth* and WAS DEAD, and behold I am alive for evermore." Rev. 1: 18.

The *I* here, whatever constitutes the identity of Christ and now liveth, that self-same identity was most assuredly dead. As Jesus lives, soul, body, and spirit; so Jesus died, soul body, and spirit. Yea, he actually gave his LIFE, for he poured out his BLOOD upon the cross, and poured out his SOUL unto DEATH, "that HE, by the grace of God, should TASTE DEATH for every man." Heb. 2: 9.

Paul says that "CHRIST died .... and .... was BURIED and .... that he rose from the dead."—1 Corth. 15: 3, 4, 12.

There is no force in the argument of Paul, if Christ did not die literally—if his spirit lived in a state of equal life and activity, as when it animated the temple of dust. How could Paul testify that God raised up Jesus from the dead, if when he was in the grave, his living soul did not die? And surely he would be found a false witness unto God, because he testified that he raised up Christ from THE DEAD, whom he raised not up, if Christ DID NOT DIE.

Emanuel Swedenborg believed that Christ did not die, that he only seemed to die, and that his spirit was alive, and that he could not die! and alas! alas! there are too many Christians that believe that Jesus Christ did not die, and that he only seemed to die, and that he could not die, and that his spirit was alive, and conscious and happy [! !] while his body was in the grave! ! ! Oh that men should permit this pagan fable of *inherent immortality*, to deprive them of their reason, and of their reverence for the word of God!

Pious reader, "BEWARE lest any man spoil *you* through philosophy and vain deceit, *after the tradition of men*, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ."—Col. 2: 8.

The sacrificial system emphatically symbolized Christ the sacrifice.

Gen. 22: 7.—"God will provide himself a lamb, my son," exclaimed the pious patriarch; and John proclaims, "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." That sin that brought death into the world; and Christ by taking that sin in all its penal consequences upon himself, though he was without sin, and suffering the penalty, has purchased the right *to restore* us all to life *again* by a resurrection from the dead.

Rev 5: 10.—"Worthy is the *Lamb* that *was slain* to receive power, .... and glory .... for *thou* wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God BY THY BLOOD .... and we shall reign on the earth."

Isa. 53: 7.—"He is brought as a *lamb* to the slaughter."

There were two points in which the sacrificial lamb resembled Christ. It was without spot and blemish, as an emblem of the purity and innocency of Christ; and its blood, or life, or soul, was poured out upon the altar for others—for an atonement for sin.

Lev. 17: 11.—"For the LIFE of the flesh is in the BLOOD; and I have given it to you upon the altar, to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the BLOOD that maketh an atonement for the soul .... 14th v., for the *life* of all flesh IS the BLOOD thereof."

"Ye know that ye were .... redeemed ....

with the precious BLOOD of CHRIST, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot."—1 Peter 1 : 18.

"This is my BLOOD of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins."—Mat. 26 : 28.

"I lay down my life for the sheep."—John 10: 15.

The careful reader will readily perceive these points of resemblance in all these texts—and they might be multiplied—that the life of the lamb corresponds with the blood of the lamb ; and, likewise between these, and the life of Christ, and the blood of Christ, and each of these separately is said to have made an atonement for the souls or lives of men. The lamb was sacrificed for sin—Christ was sacrificed for sin; the life of the lamb was made an atonement—the life of Christ was made an atonement; the blood of the lamb made an atonement—the blood of Christ makes an atonement. And these terms are used interchangeably as equally representing the same thing. Thus perfectly does the type resemble the anti-type. There are other points in which the sacrificial lamb resembled Christ. It was without spot and blemish, as an emblem of the purity and innocency of Christ. And as the blood or life of the lamb was poured out upon the altar, and sprinkled upon the mercy-seat, within the veil; so the blood or life of Christ was poured out upon the altar of the cross, and he hath passed with his *own blood* to the mercy-seat of heaven, where he ever liveth to intercede for us. As the penalty of the law was death, the lamb, as representing Christ, suffered the penalty of the law, and so Christ, in like manner, was slain for us. As the death of the lamb involved a suspension of consciousness, so the death of the Lamb of God involved, in like manner, a suspension of consciousness. As the lamb died, soul, body, and spirit: so Christ died, soul, body, and spirit. "As Jonas (the whole of Jonas) was three days and three nights in the whale, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." Mat. 12: 40.

As Christ, the Son of man, died as man dies; therefore man, like Christ, dies soul, body, and spirit. As the lamb did not die a spiritual death—so Christ did not die a spiritual death; therefore spiritual death is not a part of the penalty of the law inflicted on man.

As Christ did not die for the brute creation, therefore the brute creation will not have their consciousness restored, as some have argued. But as Christ did die for man, for the whole race; therefore there will be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just, and of the unjust. As the offering up of the body and blood of the lamb symbolized Christ's death till he came the first time, with the true sin offering, even himself—which he once offered for the sin of the world—so the bread and the wine in the supper of the Lord, represent the true sin offering, his death, till he comes again the second time. And if the bread and the wine represent Christ's broken body, and spilled blood; and if the body and the blood were not alive; how does the partaking of these symbols, show forth Christ's death till he come? But the body and the blood were alive; and the breaking of the one, and the spilling of the other, necessarily involved the *loss* of life.

"Except ye eat the *flesh* of the Son of man, and drink his *blood*, ye have NO LIFE in you. Whoso eateth my *flesh* and drinketh my *blood*, hath eternal life; and I WILL RAISE HIM UP AT THE LAST DAY."—John 6 : 54.

"Present your BODIES a LIVING sacrifice." "Let not sin reign in your MORTAL BODY." "He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also *quicken* your *mortal bodies*."—Rom. 12 : 1; 6 : 12; 8 : 11.

"For we which live are always delivered unto death for Jesus' sake, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our MORTAL FLESH."—2 Corth. 4 : 11.

If the body were not living, it could not be mortal, and subject to death. The organization of a watch may be broken up—may be destroyed—but it cannot be killed, because it never had life. Will you say this is materialism? Be it so, nevertheless, it is the word of God that liveth and abideth for ever ; and the Christian shrinks not from any consequences deducible from the unadulterated word. If it be not the wine, where is the element in the Lord's supper, that represents the soul that was *poured out* in a crimson stream unto death ; the soul that was made an offering for sin? Say not this is a hard saying; who can hear it? Christians, "Will ye also go away?"

Isa. 53 : 8.—"For HE (Christ) was cut off out of the land of the living."

Acts 2 : 32.—"*This Jesus* hath God *raised up*, whereof we all are witnesses." "This Jesus," the same that went in and out among them, was altogether cut off out of the land of the living, and this same Jesus did God raise up; and if Christ was thus cut off, how say some among you, that the Spirit of Christ entered the land of the living at death? This is the land of the living, and the grave is the land of darkness, as darkness itself; and of the shadow of death, without any order, and where the light is as DARKNESS."—Job 10 : 21.

Upon the supposition that Christ wholly died, how easy to explain that text that has so puzzled the commentators.

Heb. 5 : 7.—"Who in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications, with strong crying and tears, unto him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared." Christ did not pray to be saved from dying ; but from the dominion of death ; that is, to rise again, and he was heard, and raised from the dead on the third day. This solves all difficulties. If Christ ceased to live, and became utterly unconscious, then "Christ died according to the scriptures, and was raised again the third day," and proved to be the Son of God with power. "And if Christ died, and rose again, even so, those that sleep in Jesus, (are unconscious in the graves,) shall God bring with him"—at his second coming. It is therefore evident, that Jesus was not raised from the dead, by any inherent, or adhering, or separated principle, or power, belonging exclusively to him in his humiliation ; he being entirely under the dominion of death; but by the omnipotent energy of the Eternal Spirit, and was declared to be the Son of God with power. This same Jesus Christ will come in the clouds of heaven to raise the dead to life and consciousness.

The incontrovertible argument against inherent immortality, drawn from the resurrection of the dead, belongs more particularly to the next question : but it can well be spared.

Thus consistent, harmonious, and scriptural, are the arguments that sustain the natural mortality of the soul of man : and thus conclusively and unanswerably is established the negative of the first question : viz:

"That *immortality* is NOT *the natural* endowment of man, nor of any part of man, when he comes into the world." And as it will be proved that immortality is a gift bestowed subsequently to birth, and this being incompatible with the first question, and they cannot both be true, therefore the negative of the *first* question is doubly proved. And further be it remembered, that the burden of proof of the first question, rests entirely upon those that affirm inherent immortality of man; and hence let the preceding arguments have double weight.

The advocates of natural immortality, bring forward some inconclusive arguments, from reason, from philosophy, and from tradition, which, even if they were plausible—but they are not—weigh nothing against the plain and positive declarations of the word of God. These are passed for the present, and those apparent inferences seemingly drawn from the Scripture, will be examined in the sequel.

## THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

### WHAT IS IT? AND WHERE LOCATED?

BY THE EDITOR.

If men would have less to do with *fancy* and more with the Bible and common sense, we should have less difficulty in understanding the Scriptures. They soar away above the stars, and thus live on a fancy God, a fancy heaven; and to them the Kingdom of God is a creation of their own imagination. If we but understood, it is with *this world* we have to do, and not with an imaginary one, we should be saved from infinite perplexity in regard to what is Scripture truth; but a large portion of professed christians, like heathen philosophers, will take rapturous flights in the fields of fancy. We give the following as a specimen. It is a flight of imagination by a Clergyman of much talent and reputation, not far off. He said, in speaking of heaven:—

"There are millions in that world of glory that once lived here. Heaven is made up of little colonies, filled up with those we loved on earth, looking down on us from above the stars. That mother in heaven when she sees her son, on earth, coming back to God how her heart swells—she gives a shout of joy in high heaven" !

How does this popular minister know that "heaven is made up of *little colonies?*" How does he know those colonies are filled up with those *we loved* on *earth?*" Is he certain that all such are there? How does he know that heaven is located "*above the stars*?" Some of those stars are at such distance from this earth that it is supposed it would take the *light* from them thousands, if not millions of years to reach "this earth:" yet far off, up there these "little colonies" are located!! Aye; and the sharp eyes of those "immaterial spirits" can "*look* down on us!" Yes, and "*see*" us, too! Wonders on wonders, truly! Aye, more. "That mother" in that far off place "*sees* her son, on earth coming back to God;" yes, "how her [immaterial] heart *swells*!" What next? "She gives a shout of joy in high heaven"!!! But how does this minister "on earth" know this is so? He has *fancied* this mother up in heaven with her *motherly feelings*. Now let him not flinch from his position, but let him go on with his fancy, and fancy that mother "*sees*" a beloved daughter, that she left on earth, dying; and as she expires she is plunged down to howl and wail with devils and damned ghosts in endless and unmitigated torture! Does "her heart swell" now? Does "she give a shout of joy in high heaven"? Or, does "her heart" *wither*, and "she give a" *groan of horror*? Please tell us, *Mr. Fancyman*. Do not flinch. Has that mother's *heart* all at once turned to *stone?* Is she unmoved at this sight, and as her daughter goes on groaning in anguish, in ceaseless ages of torture, is that mother to remain unmoved?

Let it be remembered, the minister of whom we are speaking is, by profession, a believer in endless torture; he is not therefore to turn away from our suggestion with the reply—"That is none of our concern." He has concerned himself in the other. But all this is *fancy:* so we will awake from it and attend to sober *facts* as developed in the Scriptures of truth.

#### LOCATION OF THE KINGDOM.

Our inquiry about the Kingdom of God we commence with our Lord's words to his followers, as recorded Matth. 25: 34. "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom *prepared* for you from the FOUNDATION *of the world.*" Here is a clear indication of the *location* of the kingdom. It is not a kingdom "above the stars." As our Lord refers us, in his language, directly back to the beginning of this world, we turn to Genesis, first chapter. Here we learn, verses 26 to 28, that this earth is the place of the kingdom, and see that man was here given dominion. "God said let us make man * * * and let them have *dominion* * * * over *all the earth.* So God created man * * * male and female created he them. And God *blessed* them, and God said to them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish *the earth*, and subdue it; and have *dominion* * * over every LIVING THING that moveth upon the earth."

Here, most assuredly, is a kingdom, and dominion is given, "from the foundation of the world." But we will compare it with Psa. 8. "What is man? * * Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, [Elohim—Gods] and hast crowned him with glory and honour. *Thou* MADEST *him to have dominion* over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things under his feet," &c.

In Eden, then, we find the Kingdom of God in its *embryotic* state—or state of development. *Eden* was the *place* of the *throne*, or seat of Empire. That place is the same that we call *Palestine*, on the western border of Asia, or the east of the Mediterranean sea. That Eden and Palestine are one, in location, the examination of a few texts will serve to satisfy us. In Ezekiel 28th, the Lord, in addressing "the prince of Tyrus," says "Thy heart is lifted up, and thou hast said, I am a God, *I sit in the seat of God*," &c. At verses 13 and 14 the Lord saith to the "king of Tyrus"—"*Thou hast been in Eden, the Garden of God* * * * thou wast upon the *holy mountain* of God," &c. Tyrus lay on the northwest border of Palestine proper, and is, in fact, a part of the land that God included in the gift to Abraham and his seed. Ezekiel 31st, the Lord directed the prophet to speak unto Pharaoh king of Egypt, and say to him, "the Assyrian was a ceader in Lebanon," 3; verses 8 and 9, "The ceaders in the *garden of God* could not hide him * * nor any tree in the *garden of God* was like unto him in beauty. I have made him fair * * * so that all the *trees of Eden*, that were in the *garden of God* envied him." We then have a description of his pride and punishment; and it is added, verse 16, "I made the nations to shake at the sonnd of his fall

when I cast him down to hell with them that descend into the pit; and all the *trees of Eden*, the choice and best of Lebanon, * * * shall be comforted," &c. The prophet then turning directly to Pharaoh, adds—"To whom art thou like in glory and greatness, *among the trees of Eden?* Yet thou shalt be brought down with the "*trees of Eden.*"

Here is Egypt on the southwest border of Palestine—Assyria on the east, or north-east—and Tyrus on the north-west, all said to be *with, among*, or near by, the trees of the garden of Eden, or garden of God. Such evidence seems clearly to indicate that Eden and Palestine are identical in their *location.* If so, we have found the truth of what we before suggested, *viz.*—That in Palestine the kingdom of God was set up, in its embryotic state, at "the foundation of the world"; or from the creation of Adam. That was the *seat* of empire—*the throne* was there. Adam lost the throne and dominion, and was driven out from it, and refused any further access to it.

### What is the Kingdom of God?

After the flood God reconstructed the kingdom, in *embryo*, through Moses and Joshua, preparatory to the coming of the King of His own selection. That kingdom was erected on the old ground, or Eden. That this reconstruction was the kingdom of God we will now endeavor to show.

We will first look at Acts 1: 6. The disciples asked our Saviour—"Lord wilt thou at this time *restore again* the kingdom to Israel?" Let it be recollected that the preaching of Christ and his apostles, during all their ministry, had been "The Kingdom of God:" and after our Lord's resurrection the "forty days" that he remained on earth with his disciples he was "speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God:" see Acts 1: 3. Immediately at the close of those forty days is the question—"Wilt thou at *this time* restore *again* the kingdom to Israel?" Our Lord does not intimate that they were in error in *fact*; and therefore we conclude that the Kingdom of God and the Kingdom of Israel are identical. Jesus does not correct their view on this point—of the restoration of *that kingdom*—of that being the kingdom of God: but only informs them, it was not for them to know the times . . . . which the Father hath put in his own power." We say then—The Kingdom of Israel was, and is, the Kingdom of God; first in its embryotic state, but at length to be fully developed; at which time the second Adam—Jesus Christ—will have the throne—the seat of empire and dominion.

In further proof on this subject let us now turn to the First Book of Chronicles. King David, at the close of his life, 1 Chron. 29: 11, said—"Blessed be thou Lord God of Israel our father * * * Thine O Lord is the greatness and the power * * * thine is the kingdom," &c. What kingdom is this? In the previous chapter, verses 4 to 7 David speaks thus:—"The Lord God of Israel chose me * * * to be king over Israel for ever, * * * * and of all my sons he hath chosen Solomon my son to sit upon the throne of *the kingdom of the* Lord over Israel. And he said unto me; * * * I will establish *his kingdom for ever*," &c. In the next chapter, verse 23, it is said—"Then Solomon *sat on the* Throne *of the* Lord as king instead of David his father; and all Israel obeyed him."

Here is sufficient evidence to justisfy us in saying—That in Scripture language the Kingdom of God—the Kingdom of the Lord, and the Kingdom of Israel, are identical. But we may compare this testimony in Chronicles with a prophecy by Micah, Chap. 4: 6—8; speaking of the day when men shall beat their swords into ploughshares, &c., it is added—"In that day, saith the Lord, will I assemble her that halteth, and gather her that is driven out; and her that I have afflicted; and I will make her that halted a remnant, and her that was cast far off a strong nation: and the Lord shall reign over them *in Mount Zion* from henceforth even for ever. And thou, O tower of the flock, the strong hold of the daughter of Zion, unto thee shall it come, *even the first dominion;* The Kingdom shall come to the daughter of Jerusalem."

Here is confirmatory evidence of the position we have previously established; but we will compare this again with 1 Chron. 17: 9—14. The Lord here, in addressing David, said—"I will raise up of thy seed after thee . . . . . and I will establish *his kingdom* . . . . . and I will settle him in my house, and in My Kingdom for ever: and his throne shall be established for evermore."

If it be said, the *seed* here spoken of is Solomon, it still confirms the fact that the Kingdom of Israel is the Kingdom of God, and so God here expressly calls it—"My *Kingdom.*" Though Solomon might be the *mediate* king spoken of, it is evident the Messiah is the *ultimate* one; and thus we find Gabriel announcing to Mary, concerning Jesus, "The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever: and of his kingdom there shall be no end," Luke 1: 32, 33. Thus we have fully confirmed that the Kingdom of Israel and the Kingdom of God, are one and the same.

### Was this Kingdom ever Subverted?

We now inquire—*Was this kingdom ever taken from Jacob's posterity?* We need now to adduce but one text in proof on this point, and that is Ezek. 21: 25—27. "Thou profane wicked prince of Israel, whose day is come, . . . . . thus saith the Lord God, Remove the diadem, and take off the crown; . . . . I will overturn, overturn, *overturn* it: and *it* shall be no more, until He *come* whose right *it* is; and I will give it him."

Thus we see, that the kingdom of Israel, or the kingdom of God, was overturned, or "perverted;" but it was done with the certainty that it would be *re*-established, The re-establishment is the subject of many prophecies, in the old testament, and is what the new testament calls the Kingdom of God.

### The Work of Messiah at his First Advent.

Messiah did not come the first time to Restore the kingdom, but to prepare his followers to be Rulers in it when *restored*, and over all the earth. He first offered this honor to the Jews. It had originally been offered to the whole of Jacob's posterity, shortly after their advent from Egypt. Thus, Exodus 19: 5, 6, the Lord said—"If ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then shall ye be a peculiar treasure unto me *above all people*—for all the earth is mine—and ye shall be unto me a *kingdom of priests*," *&c.* But they did not fulfil the condition; and God first *divorced* the "ten tribes," or the kingdom of Israel, and cast them far off from the territory: see 2 Kings 17: 18—23. Some time after that he punished the Jews, or kingdom of Judah, in Babylon; from which captivity *they* returned.

Then, when the "threescore and two weeks" spoken of, Dan, 9th, were fulfilled, "God spoke" to the Jews "by His Son:" see Heb. 1: 1,2. *What did he speak to them?* He offered them to be "*heirs*" of the kingdom of God, or Rulers in the kingdom Restored to Israel, under the Reign of Messiah, "David's Son" on "David's Throne."

In order to their enjoying this high honor he called them to *repentance* for past and present wickedness. When they refused this, and put to death the *King*, the offer of the *heirship* of the Kingdom of God was taken from them as a nation: see Matthew 21: 38—43. Or, in the words of Jesus, as there recorded—"The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to *a nation* bringing forth the fruits thereof." Jesus Christ being the true *Heir* of the throne, and having the right to select those who should share in the honor of the government, in the kingdom to be set up, or restored, next sent his ministers to those not under the law covenant, to "take out of them a people for his name"—even the "*Royal Priesthood*," &c., see Acts 15: 14; and 1 Peter 2: 9.

Such a Priesthood is a Kingly one. From this honor, we have said, Judah, as a nation, has been excluded for her *wilful* rejection of the Son of God —"*the Heir*." Since that rejection, the gospel—the *glad tidings*—has been sent to others who never were under the covenant made by Moses, or who had, previous to the first advent, been divorced from that covenant relation, and were not sharers in the rejection of Messiah. Such, Christ now invites to the honor and dignity of becoming "heirs of God and joint heirs with" himself in the throne and kingdom of Israel; called the kingdom of heaven, or kingdom of God; and so soon as the number of "joint heirs," or Rulers, are completed, that kingdom will be set up, or developed in its fullness and glory.

If we would attain to this high honor and glory, the first step is to "Repent and believe the Gospel," or the *good news*—the "glad tidings"—of God's love to us who were not under the law covenant, or who having been given a bill of divorce and sent away prior to the first advent are now mercifully called to be heirs under a new covenant. How great has been the love of God and his Christ towards us, in following us who were afar off, and inviting us to such honor and glory. To attain this high and exalted inheritance we must become holy, or *Christ-like*. We must repent of all our sins and turn away from all iniquity. Without doing this we cannot be heirs of the kingdom of God. It is by a "patient continuance in well doing," *seeking* "for honor and glory, and immortality," that this great blessing can be attained, and we be crowned with "*eternal life*." None others can *reign* with Christ in the Kingdom of God.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD, when restored, or set up, will consist of a *King-Associate Rulers—Citizens—Dependencies—Territory*, and *Laws*.

1. A KING; *Jesus the Messiah*. God has demonstrated his pleasure in this matter by *raising up* Jesus from the dead. If the fact of Jesus' resurrection from the dead is established, the fact of his Messiahship is put beyond controversy, and his Kingship is undeniable.

2. ASSOCIATE RULERS;—These consist of such as have suffered with Christ, made *immortal*; no more subject to death; but, like their king, endowed with endless life by virtue of their union with him; so that they will reign for ever and ever.

3. THE CITIZENS;—These are Restored Israel and Judah; constituted once more "*one nation*"; and will be the *inhabitants* of the *territorial* kingdom. In proof of this we have only space now for one or two out of many texts. Jeremiah thus records the Lord's will in this matter, Jer. 23: 5—8. "Behold, the days come, saith the *Lord*, that I will raise unto David a *Branch*, and a king shall reign and prosper, and shall execute justice and judgment *in the earth*. IN HIS DAYS Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely," &c. In the 3d verse the "Lord God of Israel" had said, "I will gather the remnant of my flock out of all countries whither I have driven them, and will bring them *again* to their folds; and they shall *be fruitful and increase*." After having said, verse 6, "In his days Judah shall be saved and Israel shall dwell safely," &c. he adds, verses 7 and 8, "*Therefore*, behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that they shall no more say, The LORD liveth which brought up the children of Israel out of *Egypt*; but the LORD liveth, which brought up and which led the seed of the house of Israel out of the *north* country, and from all countries whither I had driven them; and *they shall dwell in their own land*." Ezekiel is still more particular; and the LORD, after describing their restoration, and becoming "*one nation*," saith—"And they shall dwell in the land that I have given unto Jacob my servant, *wherein your fathers have dwelt*, and they shall dwell therein, they and their children, and their children's children *for ever*," &c. These, then constitute the *citizens*, or inhabitants of the territorial kingdom of God.

4. DEPENDENCIES:—These are the "*left of the nations*." They are *not citizens* of the kingdom, but are under its Dominion and Government; and will be required to submit to that Government; or, if any refuse they will be destroyed. But we have not space now to enlarge on this topic; and pass to notice—

5. THE TERRITORY:—The Kingdom of God has its Territory, and is not the whole habitable globe, much less up "above the stars." It is that described to Abraham, Gen. 15: 18, "In the same day the LORD made a covenant with Abraham, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, *from the river of Egypt*, unto the great river, the river Euphrates." It is elsewhere also described, but this is sufficiently definite, as we have established the point that the kingdom of Israel and the kingdom of God are identical. Besides, it is clear from the words of our Lord, Mat. 8: 11, that all the territory of the earth is not embraced in the territory of the kingdom of God. He saith—"Many shall come from the *east* and *west* and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven:" words which can hardly be reconciled to the idea that all the earth is the kingdom proper. The *Dominion* is over the whole world, or habitable globe: "from sea to sea, and from the river [the great river Euphrates] to the ends of the earth." Thus Daniel saw given to one like the Son of man, "*Dominion*, and glory, *and a kingdom*, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his *dominion* is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." Dan. 7: 13, 14.

Let it be understood, then, that while the dominion is universal, the kingdom proper, or *territorial* kingdom, is between the river of Egypt and the river Euphrates. On this territory was the kingdom of God "prepared from the foundation of the

world:" there was fixed the *throne;* first occupied by Adam, but forfeited by him; afterwards occupied by the kings of the house of Jacob; finally lost by them, and now remains to be occupied by David's Son—the second Adam—the Lord from heaven; when the throne, first established by God in Eden, will become permanently occupied—the kingdom be duly organized—the dominion be universal—the reign eternal. One thing more is to be noticed, *viz.*—

6. THE LAW:—This will go forth from *Zion*, the *seat* of empire and throne of the King. Thus the prophecy of Micah speaks:—"But in the last days * * * the law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem. And he shall judge [or rule] among the people, and rebuke strong nations afar off; and they shall beat their swords into plough-shares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more; but they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree; and none shall make them afraid: *for the mouth of the* LORD of hosts *hath spoken it.*"

The laws are such as to secure *peace*, and will promote prosperity, universal contentment, and happiness. Such is the teaching of the Bible in relation to the Kingdom of God, and the happiness consequent upon its re-establishment, and full development. Here is *reality*—not fancy—not a flying "above the stars," no one knows where; but an *inheriting the earth*, as Christ our Lord and king said the *meek* should do. Let us make haste to secure a part in the "Royal Priesthood." If *we* reject this offered mercy and honor, *we* have nothing to expect but ruin and death. Our guilt will be terribly aggravated; and our doom fearful and unalterable; even to "*be punished with everlasting destruction.*"

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

## PHILADELPHIA, JANUARY, 1851.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—We send this number to some who were our patrons last year, though they have not yet sent us their subscriptien money for the present volume. If they wish us to continue it we shall expect to hear from them before another number is issued.

In some instances we have sent a copy of this number to Post Masters; and hope they may be sufficiently interested to act as Agents in receiving and forwarding money for us, as they have a right to do *free of charge*, if they are disposed. If they cannot act as agents, they will much oblige if they will hand the Examiner to some person who will be interested to circulate it.

Any person who has not heretofore been a subscriber, receiving this number, will consider it a respectful invitation to subscribe, but if he does not choose to do so, he need not return it, but be so kind as to put it into some other hands who may feel an interest in the matter.

Any person who will send us three dollars, free of expense, with the names of *three new subscribers*, shall receive the Examiner for 1850, (Vol. V.,) *in sheets*, as a premium, to be sent to their order. When the *premium* is intended to be claimed it must be distinctly stated; otherwise we shall not send it. This offer will continue until the edition of 1850 is exhausted, or we give notice to the contrary. We have two or three hundred sets of that volume remaining.

Those who wish for the back volumes of the Examiner will see on the last page on what terms they can be had; and please do not lose sight of our Catalogue of "*Books, Pamphlets*, &c." We hope you will scatter them by thousands this year. Our friends have done well in this matter the past year, and we trust they will double their diligence while the day lasts.

In regard to the *matter*, with which the Examiner is filled monthly, we say,—It must, of necessity, differ from a weekly paper. We cannot publish all that we would, if we were not limited in space. It is our intention to give that which, in our judgment, will best promote the great gospel truth, found as our *motto*, at the head of our paper, *viz*: "NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE." We regard this as the foundation truth of the entire gospel scheme; and until this point is understood, men are, and must of necessity be, bewildered as to the real nature and design of the gospel.

The articles of this number are long, yet we think none of our readers will regret the time it may take to read them carefully.

For the want of room, we have been obliged to leave out our list of Tracts on last page, but we keep a full supply.

---

"MYSTERIOUS RAPPINGS."—We commenced our remarks on these manifestations in the last volume of the Examiner; and noticed, briefly, their rise and progress—the object in making them; and gave special attention to the "Spirit Messenger."

We now return to the consideration of the "Spiritual Philosopher." Towards its editor we feel nothing but the most sincere good will; and God is our record that it is with tears we have contemplated his present perilous position. We have loved him, and we love him still; and nothing but conviction of duty could induce us to take a position so antagonistical to his. We respect him as a man; and we know he is not lacking in intelligence; yet we are assured he has become sadly involved in a most fearful deception. We shall therefore speak plainly, though, we trust, kindly. Mr. Sunderland has been an eminent lecturer and practitioner in "Pathetism," since he was a Methodist Preacher. His proficiency in Pathetism, we judge, has prepared the way for his present views, which we

regard as only another step in the same course, and to the same end.

The manner in which Mr. Sunderland was finally convinced of the reality of the *presence* and communications of spirits, he relates in his Spiritual Philosopher, No. 1, pages 7 and 8; from which we give the following extract. It was in New York, last June, at an examination of the subject in the presence of a number of persons. He says—

"I asked,—'Are there any spirits present who will respond to me?' 'Yes.' Then I proceeded to write down the names of all my near relatives who have departed this life; and placing my pencil on each name, I asked, 'Is it this?' and in this way was given to understand that it was the spirit of a beloved sister, whose hand I held in mine 22 years ago, while she left the body. Then followed other questions, and which were answered thus:—*Ques.* How old were you when you left this sphere? *Ans.* 'Twenty-nine.' This was true. *Q.* What was your given name? *A.* 'Sally.' True. *Q.* Where did you depart this life? *A.* 'Oxford, Mass.' True. *Q.* Will you communicate with me in Boston, at my house? *A.* 'Yes.' *Q.* How soon? *A.* 'Within four weeks.' I then asked her, 'Shall I stay here to hold further conversation with you?' and she called for the alphabet, and spelled out as follows: '*No, you need not. I will talk with you away from this place.*' I asked her numerous other questions, which were promptly answered, and which left no more room for me to doubt but that I was *really* conversing with the spirit of my dear departed sister, than that I had once such a sister in this sphere, and at whose bedside I watched with an affection which death has not dissolved."

Mr. Sunderland next proceeds to give an account of an interview with his two infant boys, who died several years since; it is as follows:—

"*Ques.*—Will the spirits present respond to me? *Ans.*—Yes. *Q.*—Shall I know who it is with whom I am conversing? *A.*—Yes. *Q.*—Is it my father? *A.*—No. *Q.*—My sister? *A.*—No. *Q.*—Is it H. ? C. M.? *A.*—No. *Q.*—Is it my two sons? *A.*—Yes. *Q.*—What was your name? *A.*—La Roy."

Mr. Sunderland at this point says—

"To enable the reader to appreciate what follows, it may be well to state, that my first born son died in Salem N. H., September 5, 1835, aged six weeks. My second son died in Springfield, N. J., Aug. 29, 1841, aged three months. Each was an only son at the time of death, and how deeply my soul was wounded in seeing them cut down thus early in life, no words could describe. My views of the spirit world, since their death, had taught me, indeed, how vastly they must have progressed in that sphere, beyond what they could have reached had they remained here."

He then proceeds in his conversation with what he supposes to be the spirits of those little "sons."

"*Q.*—Do you comprehend my mind? Do you understand what my views are of the spirit world? *A.*—Yes. *Q.*—Have you ever communicated with the spirit of your father before now, since you left this sphere? *A.*—Yes. *Q.*—Will you hereafter respond to your father as you do now? *A.*—Yes. *Q.*—Will you soon in Boston, at our home? *A.*—Yes. *Q.*—Did you touch your father this morning, before he left his room? *A.*—Yes. *Q.*—By what sign shall your father know when you communicate with him? *A.*—Touch. The sense of touch."

"Other questions," says Mr. Sunderland, "were answered by my children and sister, at different sittings." He adds,—"I have *no* doubt that what purported to be the spirits of my dear children, were what they assumed to be."

Such is an extract from Mr. S.'s account of his initiation into this school of spiritual manifestations. It will be seen that he was prepared for it by his belief in the natural immortality theory; and he never once suspects the truth of the apostle's declaration that "Satan himself is *transformed* into an angel of *light*:" 2 Corth. 11: 14. And Mr. S. has said, "Give us light,—no matter how it comes." A fearful prayer, truly! And we fear, in his case, it is fearfully answered; and that our fears are not groundless we "have *no* doubt" will be seen as we proceed in our investigations of this matter. The "Philosopher," in speaking of the "Spiritual Era," as it calls the present age, says—

"It is the period to which the hopes of generations, long since passed away, had been reaching forward. 'Prophets and kings waited long, but died without the sight.'" On the "Origin of Man" it says—"As to the 'Mosaic Record,' it affords us but little assistance indeed, in our attempts to settle any question connected with *Anthropology*. We are not aware that Moses either understood it, or designed to teach the present inhabitants of the earth on this subject at all. We should as soon undertake to dress and regulate our dietetic habits as Moses did, as we should to shape our views by his on the origin of the human race."

Here is seen how the Spiritual Philosopher is to "*shape*" its course. The Mosaic account of "the *origin* of the human race" is to be given to the winds as unworthy of credit. This is but one flashing out of the "*light*" that it is "no matter how it comes"! Truly, our "Spiritual Era" is likely to bring astounding developements. Page 55 the Philosopher says—

"*Death* is to the spirit what the *birth* is to the human body. Death does not alter the *qualities* or *powers* of the mind. It is simply the *transition* of the Spirit FORM from a lower to a higher sphere, where it is in a better condition for progressing to a higher degree, both of goodness and truth."

No wonder the Philosopher should desire to bring the "Mosaic Record" into discredit; for, if death is simply a *transition* into a better condition, &c., then the threatening to Adam, as recorded by Moses, "simply" meant, if man sinned, God would give him a "transition," *i. e.* a *removal*, into a "better condition;" and so a reward was offered for sin, which Adam and Eve would have been exceeding unwise not to accept. No wonder then, they so soon laid hold on the proffered benefit, and partook of the forbidden fruit.

The Philosopher adds:—

"Hence, it is a great mistake to suppose, that because a spirit has merely left the body, that, therefore, it must necessarily know all about everything. We might as well suppose that, because a person was inside of a college, therefore, he must be equal to Sir Isaac Newton in Mathematical Science. Spirits differ in the degrees of their knowledge and goodness, precisely as human beings differ. There may be great goodness, but little knowledge, and *vice versa.*"

This is said to account for the *mistakes* which the spirits sometimes make in giving answers to questions. Hence the Philosopher goes on to say:—

"Responses from the Spirit World are never to be wholly depended upon, *except when they come from spirits whom we knew in the body;* or, when they come from others we should be assured of their *identity.* We need the same conditions, or guarantees, for believing spirits, that we do for believing human testimony."

Thus it will be seen, while all who die are gainers all are not so advanced in knowledge as always to give correct information when inquired of.

These spirits give *sensible* evidence of their presence sometimes. Mr. Sunderland says:

"In Auburn, [N. Y.] Augnst 9, 1850, the spiritual hand of one of my sons was placed upon my head, where it was kept with a gentle motion, pressing back and forth, (to make me *sensible* of what it was,) for nearly five minutes."

Of course, "disembodied spirits" cannot be "immaterial," for they have hands that can be *felt*, if Mr. Sunderland is not mistaken. If the subject were not too serious to be trifled with, it would be amusing to note some things related of these spirits; for example, the following account of Mr. Sunderland:

"I asked my children if they could spell? They said no, they had had no use for the alphabet in the world where they lived; but they would ask their aunt, my sister, to learn them. This was Friday. The next Wednesday night I asked them if they had learned to spell? The oldest one said he had, and giving the call for the alphabet, he spelled this sentence,—'I have learned to spell *done!*' I then asked him to spell something for his father to remember. He commenced, and rapped out the following:—'*Father dear! I look like you.*'"

How the intelligent mind of Mr. Sunderland could be so imposed upon, it is hard for us to conceive. The spirit professed on Friday that it could *not* "*spell.*" The next Wednesday it had learned to spell "*done;*" but in giving that information it was spelling all the while; for it "spelled this sentence," says Mr. S.—"*I have learned to spell* done"!! Here are *five words* besides "*done*"! But this is not all; for, when Mr. S. asked it "to spell something for his father to remember" it *spelled*—"Father dear! I look like you"!! Six words more; making *eleven* words in all, besides "*done*"! Truly, this was "done" a little too much for any mind not already taken captive, and so blinded to the deception. The facts as stated by Mr. Sunderland we do not question; but that the spirit which gave these responses was the spirit of his son we do not for a moment believe: to our mind it was clearly a deception by one practised in lying.

(To be continued.)

---

"DEMONOLOGY."—We had so often heard the Lecture of Alexander Campbell on this subject extolled as a master refutation of the doctrine that "there is *no knowledge* in sheol"—the state of the dead—that we had a great desire to see it, but never could find it till recently. We are indebted to the Pneumatologist for it now. We expected, from its fame, that we should find ourself hard pushed, and supposed likely we might find it difficult to withstand so strong a writer as Mr. Campbell. Hence we commenced reading his "Address" with intense interest; but never were more sadly disappointed: we found nothing of the strength anticipated. His "*seven pillars,*" on which he relies, are to our mind, "pillars" of sand, which crumble by their own weight.

Dr. Campbell says—"Concerning *demons*, of what order of intelligences, what character and destiny, of what power intellectual and moral, or immoral, there has been much debate, and still there is need of farther and more satisfactory examination."

Here is a very candid confession, and shows that any popular theory extant is not "satisfactory." In the Grecian language the word, he says,—"Simply indicates a person of intelligence, *a knowing one.*" It was applied to living men of "great learning" as a "title of honor." "Some elevated the spirits of departed heroes, public benefactors," &c. "into a species of demi-gods," etc. "Among some philosophers it became the title of an object of worship," &c. Again, Dr. C. says—"The term *demon*, from simply indicating *a knowing one*, became the title of a human spirit when divested of the appendages of its clay tenement, because of its supposed initiation into the secrets of another world." This became "a divinity of the ancient superstition," etc.

Dr. C. goes on to show that such was the teaching of some of the Pagan philosophers, and says:—

"All Pagan antiquity affirms that from Titan and Saturn, the poetic progeny of Cœlus and Terra, down to Æsculapius, Proteus, and Minos, all their divinities were the ghosts of dead men, and were so regarded by the most erudite of the Pagans themselves."

But, adds Dr. C.—"The doctrine of a separate state—of disembodied ghosts, or demons—is a thousand years older * * than any Pagan historian," etc.

Very likely it is: for Satan told our mother Eve —"*Ye shall not surely die:*" and the doctrine of an emerging of the essential man into a more

"*knowing*" state when "disembodied" is only the old "*lie*" with a new dress.

"While the Bible teaches many demons," saith Dr. C., "it no where intimates a plurality of Devils or Satans. There is but one Devil or Satan in the universe," &c.

Dr. C., himself must be a *demon;* for, his *knowledge* is as wide as the "*universe,*" and there *aint* but "one Satan" in it. We are right glad of that.

But, saith Dr. C., "Satan's legions of angels and demons give him a sort of omnipresence, by acting out his will in all their intercourse with mortals."

Pray, good Dr., what are God's angels and *demons* about all this while? Or, are there no good *demons*? It really seems that the Dr. is so intent on making out his theory, of dead men being the "*knowing ones,*" that he has forgotten the fact that the Bible *never* speaks of *good* demons; a most fatal fact for his scheme. The Bible stamps the whole scheme of demons being the spirits of dead men as a lie; for it invariably represents these demons as wicked ones. A strange matter, truly, if Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the prophets are *demons*: as they must be, if Dr. C. is correct. But Dr. C. states his proposition thus:—

"*The Demons of Paganism, Judaism, and Christianity were the ghosts of dead men.*"

To establish this point he raises his "*seven pillars.*"

PILLAR 1. "All Pagan authors of note * * affirm the opinion that demons were the spirits of dead men. From Herod down to the more polished Celsus, their historians, poets, and philosophers occasionally express this opinion."

Suppose all this is true: he might as well have added—they must be Gods, because his witnesses so regarded them. Besides, Archbishop Whately shows that the Pagan Philosophers did not believe any such thing; that they had no real belief in a future state at all, and only taught it "occasionally" to keep the vulgar in awe. See the Examiner for October 1850, pages 155 to 157.

PILLAR 2. "The Jewish historians, Josephus and Philo, also avow this conviction. Josephus says, 'Demons are the spirits of wicked ones, who enter into living men and destroy them, unless they are so happy as to meet with speedy relief.' Philo says, 'The souls of dead men are called demons.'"

What does this prove? Josephus was a Pharisee; and Dr. Campbell might as well have quoted him to prove the "*trasmigration* of souls;" for the Pharisees held that notion also. But the legs of this "pillar" are not equal. Philo seems to teach that the souls of *all* dead men are called demons; Josephus, that it is the spirits of *wicked* men only. We see no strength in this pillar; for the witnesses not only seem to differ, but we know there was a large and learned portion of the Jews that did not believe in the existence of dead men's souls at all; *viz.*, the Sadducees.

PILLAR 3. "The Christian fathers, Justin Martyr, Irænеus, Origen, &c., depose to the same effect. Justin, when arguing for a future state, alleges, 'Those who are seized and tormented by the souls of dead men, whom all call demons and madmen.' Lardner, after examining with the most laborious care the works of these, and all the Fathers of the first two centuries, says, 'The notion of demons, or the souls of dead men, having power over living men, was *universally* prevalent among the heathen of these times, and believed by many Christians.'"

Mark well, this "Pillar." The notion that demons were the souls of dead men was a "*heathen*" notion," but was *not* believed by *all* Christians; though "many" had thus early departed from the Bible doctrine, that "there is *no knowledge*" in the state of the dead. Thus crumbles this "pillar."

PILLAR 4 "The Evangelists and Apostles of Jesus Christ so understood the matter:" [that is, that demons were the spirits of dead men.—ED.]

This pillar Dr. C. does not undertake to sustain by any Scripture proof: but he affirms, that was "the current signification of this term *demon* in Judea at the Christian era," and that "the Apostles and our Lord use this word in different forms seventy-five times, and on no occasion give any hint of a special, private, or peculiar interpretation of it," &c. "we are then, fully authorized to say that the demons of the New Testament were the spirits of dead men."

The notion of the transmigration of souls was equally prevalent "in Judea at the Christian era." This is clearly seen in several discourses of our Lord with his disciples; and yet he "on no occasion gave any hint of" the notion being an incorrect one. Does that prove that Christ and his apostles admitted the truth of the doctrine of the transmigration of souls? Just as much as their giving no "special interpretation" of demons proves they were the spirits of dead men. It was not the work, at that time, to explain the *nature* of *demons.* They were "evil spirits;" that was not disputed. Jesus and his apostles cast them out, or destroyed their power over men. The great point of controversy was as to *fact—Did Jesus and his apostles cast them out?* Said the Saviour to his own disciples—"I have many things to say unto you, but you cannot bear them now." To have involved the *nature* of these demons in the controversy about the *fact* of *dispossession,* at that time, would have only been to embarrass their ministry. It was left to correct itself through the influence of the doctrine of the *resurrection,* and the Scriptures when opened to their understandings. The importance of the resurrection filled the minds of the apostles after Jesus rose from the dead, and settled the question, that without a resurrection there is no future life; and even those who had "fallen asleep in Christ" were "perished;" see 1 Corth. 15: 12—18, 32.

That fact is demonstration, that whatever the apostles might have thought during our Lord's personal ministry, they did not believe demons were the souls of dead men when Paul wrote to the Corinthians.

PILLAR 5. This consists of historic evidence. It is from a passage in "the epistle to the Smyrneans, written by Ignatius, the disciple of the Apostle John. He quotes the words of our Lord to Peter when Peter supposed he saw a spirit, or a ghost. But he quotes him thus, 'Handle me and see, for I am not a *daimoon asomaton*—a disembodied demon;' —a spirit without a body. This," adds Dr. C, "places the matter above all doubt, that with them of that day a demon or ghost were equivalent terms."

Not so fast, Dr. C., you have added to the words of Ignatius, "a spirit without a body." We do not object to it, however; yet we think the words are capable of a very different construction from what you have placed upon them. You have maintained the point that demons were the ghosts or souls of dead men. If so, it would be exceedingly superfluous to say, "I am not a *disembodied* demon." Our Lord might say—"I am not a spirit without a body," for the exceedingly good reason that there is no such thing, so far as revealed to us; but there are spirits who have "not flesh and bones" as Jesus had; and that is Jesus' own explanation, however "Ignatius" might have regarded it; but these spirits are not the spirits of dead men, for reasons already noticed. But, finally, we have no reliance upon anything quoted from the so called fathers; knowing, as we do, that their writings have been corrupted, and that some of the "fathers" were turned from the simplicity of the gospel by the philosophy of the Pagans.

PILLAR 6. The Dr. erects for his sixth pillar, the "word *angel.*" This he says "is of Bible origin, and confined to those countries in which that volume is found." He tells us, the Pagans had no notions of such beings, and could not therefore use the term demon as a substitute. He says—that the term *angel* does not enter into the idea of a demon "in the Christian Scriptures, is evident for the following reasons:"

"1st. Angels were never said to enter into any one." [But, Doctor, "Satan entered into" Judas.]

"2nd. Angels have no affection for bodies of any sort, either as habitations or vehicles of action."

This is pure *assumption.* Did not angels appear in "bodies of" some "sort" to Abraham and Lot? Aye! Did they not *eat* too of Abraham's "fatted calf," etc.? Paul saith—"Be careful to entertain strangers, for some thereby have entertained *angels* unawares." Think you, they were *bodiless* beings? Or, were they in bodies for which they had "no affection?" But letting all this pass—we ask—How does Dr. C. know that "*angels* have no affection for bodies of any sort?" He has surely given us no proof except his bare assertion. Does he know that "*evil*" angels have none? If so, where did he get the knowledge of the fact?

"3rd. Angels have no predilection for tombs and monuments of the dead;" he says.

Another pure *assumption.* It looks likely, Dr., that the devil—*diabolon*, has "no predilection for tombs" when he "had the power of death," and introduced "death" into the world. Among the "tombs and monuments of the dead" is the very place where we should especially expect to find him "and his *angels*" watching his prey; knowing that there is to be an effort made by and bye to deliver those whom he has so long held in the "tombs." What the Dr. says, therefore, on this point is groundless; and his "contrast" is only in his *imagination.* Having triumphantly assumed his ground he says:—

"1st. Demons have entered into human bodies and into the bodies of inferior creatures.

"2nd. Demons evince a peculiar affection for human bodies, and seem to desire them both as vehicles of action, and as places of habitation.

"3rd. Demons also evince a peculiar fondness for their old mortal tenements: hence, we so often read of them carrying the possessed into the grave-yards, the tombs, and sepulchres, where, perchance, their old mortalities lay in ruins."

Marvellousness must be wonderfully developed in any head that can believe this last item. If "disembodied spirits" are conscious, they are either happy or miserable. If happy, the grave-yard must be a fine specimen of heaven to them, that they should have such a "*fondness*" for it! If they are miserable, they know full well their "torment" will be increased when they shall be clothed in bodies again: and yet according to Dr, C. they have "*a peculiar fondness*" for their old mortal tenements!" The doctor proceeds?—

PILLAR 7. "Among the evidences of the papal defection intimated by Paul, he associates the *doctrine concerning demons* with celibacy and abstinence from certain meats, as chief among the signs of that fearful apostacy. He warrants the conclusion that the purgatorial prisons for ghosts and the ghostly mediators of departed saints, which, equally with commanding to abstain from lawful meats, and forbidding to marry, characterise the times of which he spoke, are attributes of the same system, and indicative of the fact that *demons* and *ghosts* are two names of the same beings. To this we may add the testimony of James, who says *the demons believe and tremble* for their doom. Now all eminent critics concur that the spirits of wicked men are here intended; and need I add that oft-repeated affirmation of the demoniacs, 'We know thee, Jesus of Nazareth; art thou come to torment us before the time?' Thus all the scriptural allusions to this subject authorize the conclusion that demons are ghosts, and especially wicked and unclean spirits of dead men."

We have given this full statement of the Dr.'s "seventh pillar" that it might be fairly before the reader.

Whatever "all eminent critics concur" in, matters not to us, as we "call no man father upon

earth." The authority of Jesus Christ and his apostles is strong enough for us. Dr. Campbell has said, "There is but one Devil or Satan in the universe:" but he admits he has "*legions of angels* and demons." Will he tell us who these "legions of angels" are? as he distinguishes them from "demons," while the Scriptures, so far as we can find, make no such distinction. Besides, when the Pharisees charged our Lord with casting "out *demons* by Beelzebub the prince of the demons," Jesus said "If *Satan cast out* Satan he is divided against himself:" plainly denominating these *demons* Satan; thus explaining their true nature; Mat. 12: 26, and Peter saith, "Jesus went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of *the devil*"—*diabolou*. Here are two Scripture witnesses that demons are properly denominated "Satan and Devil," notwithstanding that *Demon* ["knowing one"] Campbell affirms, "There is but *one* Devil or Satan in the universe." Further,—Peter warns against "the devil"—*diabolos*—who "walketh about seeking whom he may devour;" but gives them no caution to beware of "the spirits of dead men;" a most necessary caution if our author's theory is true. Again: When our Lord pronounces sentence upon wicked men, Mat. 25th, he tells them to depart into everlasting fire prepared for "the devil —*diabolos*—and his *angels*." Here is another evidence that the devil or satan has a *family*, distinguished from wicked men. And though one of the household—that is the leader—is called Diabolos, or Devil, it is manifest that "his angels" are the demons—or knowing ones—of the New Testament. And this is further evident from the fact, that *a good being is* NEVER *called demon* in the New Testament—no, *not once*. A fatal fact this to Dr. Campbell's theory, and hews down his whole "*seven pillars*;" for, if his theory is true, the spirits of *good* dead men are just as much demons as the spirits of *bad* dead men: yet he has to admit, "Amongst them [the Jews] the term *demon* generally, if not universally, denoted an unclean, malign, or wicked spirit." So the truth will out. The term demon in the time of our Lord's ministry was used, and used *only*, so far as any evidence appears, to signify the devil's *angels*—his family or household; and our Lord thus denominates them more than once as we have seen.

As to what Dr. Campbell has said about Paul's reference to "papal defection," we reply—Papacy never would have come into being, and never could have lived, had not the church first fell into the Serpent's lie—"*Ye shall not surely die*"—and made death nothing but a *transition*, the essential man escaping it altogether. It was this apostacy that led on to the development called Papacy. Paul indeed foresaw it, and warned the church against being "*spoiled* through philosophy and vain deceit, after the traditions of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ;" and adds—"Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility, and worshipping of *angels*, intruding into those things which he hath not seen." The worship of the spirits of dead men he does not caution them against; for the very good reason that he had taught them that all future life depended on the resurrection from the dead. See again 1 Corth. 15: 12—18, 32. There was therefore no danger of the Church being led to worship the spirits of dead men only through the worship of *angels*, and thus apostatising into the belief of the conscious existence of dead men; which, indeed, Paul foresaw would take place in the last days; but he equally foresaw that it would be a "*departing from the faith*" of Christ and the Scriptures, and would result in the denial of the resurrection, "saying that the resurrection is past already; and overthrow the faith of some." All this has resulted from bringing into the Church the doctrine that "demons are the spirits of dead men;" and Dr. Campbell and all who travel in the same train are doing much to strengthen the papal apostacy with all its attendant blasphemies.

We have given thus much attention to the "*Demonology*" of Dr. Campbell because of the favor his work has received, and because the "Pneumatologist," in republishing it says—"We consider it fully demonstrated that the demons of the New Testament were spirits of deceased human beings."

*We* consider that point as far from being demonstrated as the old Serpent's lie to Eve. Nor can it ever be demonstrated while inspiration positively declares "*There is* NO KNOWLEDGE *in sheol*." Dr. Campbell and the Pneumatologist affirm sheol is full of *demons*—KNOWING ONES—the spirits of *dead* men; who, according to them, are *not dead*, but alive; and, of course, have *life* independent of the redemption by Christ. But we leave them to answer to their own Master, exhorting all to beware how they forestall the resurrection, and rob Christ of the honor due to the second Adam. The first Adam brought all his posterity down to the *dust*: eternally must they remain there, in "*darkness*" and "*silence*," except they are delivered by the second Adam. No RESURRECTION, No FUTURE LIFE. Let all remember that.

---

TRACTS published at the Bible Examiner Office, and the price by the *hundred*. *Rich man and Lazarus*, 75 cts. *Second Death*, by Whately, 50 cts. *Can you Believe?* by Moncrieff, 35 cts. *Two Thrones*, $1.50. From these prices *one-third* discount will be made *for cash*, if $5 worth are taken at one time.

## THE SAVIOUR'S PROMISE OF LIFE.

By Wm. Glen Moncrieff, Scotland.

"*Because I live, ye shall live also.*" John, xiv. 19.

The chapter in which these words occur, contains a discourse of our blessed Redeemer, to his eleven apostles after Judas had left the room where they had for the last time celebrated the passover together. Though the words we are to comment upon were originally addressed to apostles, it has always been admitted, whatever their correct import may be, that they are no less applicable to the faithful in all ages and climes. There are some promises made to apostles which were peculiar to them: the promise in the text is of a universal nature—not one relating to an official disciple, but to disciples as such. Hence if we are true disciples, it is to us: and it is important that we should understand it clearly. That we reach an apprehension of its golden meaning, let us search for it by considering,

I. The Foundation of the Promise: and

II. The Promise Itself made by the Saviour to his Friends.

I. The Foundation of the Promise.—"*Because I live.*" Now this language includes three ideas.

1st. *That Jesus after his death would come alive again.* He obviously cannot be understood to mean that he was to remain alive—that his enemies would not accomplish his destruction—for he yielded himself up to their malice in a very short time after the address was delivered, and they hanged him on a tree. Indeed the grand object of his visiting our world was to die; for this end he was fully prepared—this he himself frequently predicted, as prophets had done concerning him before his advent. We must then understand the words harmoniously with other portions of scriptures, and with sacred historical facts; and so viewing it, we are led to regard the words "because I live," as a prediction of a life after his decease; in other words of his resurrection from the grave. And the prophecy was fulfilled; for on the morning of the third day after his crucifixion he burst the fetters of the tomb, and came forth in newness of life. Frequently, during his brief sojourn on earth, subsequent to his resurrection, did he appear to his disciples, and eventually in the presence of the eleven went up to the right hand of the Majesty on high. Again, the words include the idea—

2d. *That this resurrected life was to be continued forever.* The force of the expression is clearly this, "Because I will come alive again, and live on forever—ye shall live also." Other scriptures express the same idea,—"Knowing that Christ being raised, dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him." Rom. vi. 9. "Who is made (a priest) not after the law of a carnal commandment but after the power of an endless life." Heb. vii. 16 And, "I am he that liveth, and was dead, and behold, I am alive for evermore." Rev. i. 18. He rose then, not like Lazarus, to a mortal life; but to glory, honor, and immortality. Mortal humanity was cast off in the tomb of Joseph; and he clothed himself with incorruptible humanity. For eighteen hundred years already has he been within the vail; but time produces on his being no change—it is immortal—beyond the reach of decay. Neither causes operating from within nor from without, can limit the duration of his existence; for in an immortal being no causes from within can come into action to create mortality; and every hostile agency without is under his control, since all power is given to him in Heaven and in earth. God manifest in mortal humanity he was prior to his death: since his resurrection he has been God manifest in sublimated, immortalized humanity, and such he will everlastingly remain. The Prince of Life is Jesus—the King eternal—immortal. On the morning of his resurrection he was shown "the path of life;" and if it had been a life to have an end, at an hour, however distant from then, it would have been the path of death, because inevitably conducting to that mournful consummation. But,

3d. *The language involves also the idea of blessedness to be as enduring as his existence itself.* Though the term "life," in itself, expresses not a kind or quality of being, since a life may be pleasant or painful or intermediate between these two extremes: yet when used as in the text before us, the idea of happiness is assuredly included. Our Redeemer's life is immortal, and immortally and absolutely blessed. Joy was set before him, and this joy he now posesses and will inherit through ceaseless duration. Before his death he was a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief; after his resurrection no sorrow mingled with his bliss: he is now and will perpetually remain beyond its reach.

Such appear to be the three grand ideas expressed by our Lord's words, which we have described as the foundation of the promise remaining for elucidation. Before advancing to the consideration of the promise, it seems proper to call attention for a moment to the fact that they are strictly speaking three *prophecies*, on which, as in the case of all his predictive announcements, he staked his character and mission. As prophecies they were either true or false, and already more than eighteen hundred years witness for their truth. Glorious testimony—witness of priceless value! We see that according to his word, he rose to life, appeared unto many, and is at this hour alive and reigning in the celestial world. Already have we got as much proof as the case can possibly admit of, that what he uttered was not falsehood; and the long continued witness of past centuries in behalf of his character is irrefragible demonstration that to the letter his words would be fulfiled, though of course a prediction of immortal being can never be absolutely accomplished, since that which is immortal is endless. He said he would leave the grave, and he left it at the specified time; he said he would leave it immortal, and he is living now, and live on he shall through interminable ages. We now proceed to the consideration of

II. The Promise which He Made to His Friends. "Because I live, *ye shall live also.*" And here we remark,

1st. *The words intimate that they also would be raised from the dead in consequence of their union to him.* The same idea is expressed by the Apostle Paul when he writes, speaking of the resurrection of saints, "Every man (will be made alive,) in his own order, Christ the first fruits, afterwards they that are Christ's at his appearing." 1 Cor. xv. 23. In like manner the prophet, "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise; awake and sing ye that dwell in dust, for thy dew is as the dew of herbs." Isa. xxvi. 19. Saints rise then as belonging to Jesus—as members of his body; the Head has been resurrected, and the reanimation

of the members follows in consequence the relationship divinely established between the Head and the members. This relationship is a covenant one—a moral or sipiritual one. Its cementing bond is faith, which works by love—faith in his love, sufferings, death and resurrection. Assuredly the wicked will rise, "for all that are in the graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth." John v. 28; but not as one with him—not *as* he rose, therefore. Forth they come unchanged in the constitution of their humanity, and therefore unfit for the kingdom of heaven: the righteous, however, emerge from the shadows of the tomb with spiritual bodies,—fashioned like unto his own glorious body, by "the power whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself." Philip: iii. 21. But again the words intimate.

2d. *That the resurrected saints will continue alive because and while he remains in being.* Because he now lives—they will all be resurrected, and live immortally because he so endures. The vine is deathless and so are the branches. In innumerable passages this is revealed as the destiny of the faithful followers of the Lamb. We will merely select a few of them:—"God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life," (or immortality.) John iii. 16. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life," (or immortality.) John iii. 36. "I give unto them ("my sheep") eternal life,"(or immortality.) John x. 28. "Neither can they die any more, for they are equal unto (on a par with) the angels." Luke xx. 36. Than the text no stronger promise of immortal being could be made, and every christian mind ought to fasten on it as an anchor sure and steadfast. "Because I live, ye shall live also." Can Jesus cease to be? Is there any conceivable possibility of his extinction? No—the king immortal cannot be quenched—the living vine cannot decay, and no less enduring will the resurrected righteous be. His life is the pledge of theirs: his immortality gives absolute security that they will never die. What a magnificent destiny awaits the lowly, Christ-loving disciple! To be immortal as his Lord: and who can fathom the wondrous depths of that word—immortality?—To be eternally expanding in being, to be immortally growing in bliss, energy, knowledge, wisdom, and love? Surely this is god-like: surely this may satisfy the loftiest cravings of our nature: surely the treasures of christianity are unspeakeably magnificent and attractive! Be it also observed that while the saints are heirs of immortality, this element of being will not be inherent in them; it is communicated to them by Jesus, just as life is imparted by the trunk of a tree to its branches; in other words they will only be immortally *sustained* in conscious existence. Their eternity of being will spring not from within, but from without: they will never feel independent of Jesus, but perpetually dependent on him for ceaseless existence and all its attending mercies and glories. Hence he will be to them all—the object of their deathless confidence, love and praise. But,

3d. *The life of the redeemed includes unmingled and eternally enduring blessedness.* According to the popular theology we are taught to believe that this is the sum of the promise under consideration; but we prefer being taught by "the master," rather than by all mortal teachers, however great may be their fame for learning and piety. Interpreted in the popular way the text no doubt expresses a truth; but one that comes far short of its glorious meaning. "Because I will be happy forever, ye shall be happy also," is truth; but when so read, the verse is deprived of the radical idea expressed by the word "life," for omitting which in the interpretation there is not the shadow of a reason. Since men, as men, are nowhere styled immortal in scripture, that is, since they are never pronounced heirs of deathless being except through faith in Christ Jesus, we are bound to understand this and all kindred language to announce, not unquenchable being of a good kind, but unquenchable being itself. Had men been heirs of immortality whatever their moral character might be, it is most reasonable to suppose, and is not any other supposition derogatory to his wisdom? that Jesus would not have used the word "live," in this promise, and in the other parallel verses, since it was actually not life properly considered he came to bestow, but a life of blessedness, which idea could easily and with perfect accuracy have been expressed by the language which he was accustomed to employ. He says "blessed are the pure in heart," and he could as easily have said my followers will be eternally blessed, had that been the grand favor he had come to procure for them by his death. While we reject the teaching that blessedness is the fundamental idea in the promise, we see no reason why to the radical idea of life—conscious being—that of happiness should not be appended, since the two in the constitution of the moral universe are indissolubly conjoined. Immortality and immortal blessedness have been divorced by the prevailing anti-scriptural systems of theology, which are producing such havoc in the world of mind. God prosper those who are humbly striving to show that these form a unity—and never to be separated on pain of Heaven's intense displeasure. And oh! what mind can approach the faintest conception of the happiness awaiting the ransomed ones. Eternity will be to them a perpetual banquet of joy. "Eye hath not seen nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." 1 Cor: ii. 9. "In thy presence is fulness of joy, at thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore." Ps. xvi. 11—"And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold the tabernacle of God is with men and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, no crying, neither shall there be any more pain, for the former things have passed away." Rev. xxi. 3, 4. If a pious man has even in this world, while reposing in God, a "peace that passeth all understanding," what will his experience be, when he is relieved of all care, freed from all sin, and every tendency toward it—when he is admitted to behold the glory of his Redeemer in the new heavens and new earth, and regaled with all its splendours and symphonies? And all this to last for ever! Not a pang to be felt, not a foe to be seen, not an element of felicity and glory are wanting; nothing but bliss—unceasing and unmingled like that of the exalted Saviour himself! "Happy is the people that is in such a case; yea, happy is the people whose God is the Lord."

And will it come? Rather we should ask, can the promise fail? "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." Observe how, as already shown, the prediction concerning himself

contained in the words "Because I live," has been literally accomplished: and the fulfilment of the text, is ample security for the realization of the last. He who speaks is the Faithful and True Witness, and we may have unwavering confidence in his word, for he has will and power to carry it into a perfect accomplishment. Trust him then, O disciple! and as surely as he now lives, thou shalt ere long see him face to face, and be satisfied with his radient and immortal likeness.

Before concluding we would affectionately urge attention to THREE INFERENCES, which naturally result from what has been said.

1st. *Men have no natural or inherent immortality.* The popular theology asserts that human beings are immortal by creation: scripture in a variety of ways affirms they are not. The text is as perspicuous a deliverance as could be made on the question: it is a promise of immortality to certain characters only—the sanctified in Christ Jesus, and here they have it not by created constitution of being. The immortality of man, therefore, is a dream and a ruinous delusion.

2d. *Immortality is obtained only through Jesus.*—He says, "He that eateth me shall live by me."—To eat the Saviour—or to "eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of man," are strong figurative expressions for receiving by faith his doctrine, and living under its power. What doctrine must the mind eat? Now we cannot more briefly exhibit it than in the words of Paul when he says of Jesus, "who loved me and gave himself for me." It was through the reception of these vital truths, that the Son of God loved him—regarded him a sinner with free and boundless compassion—and gave himself for him as a propitiation for his sins, and therefore did for him what Paul could not do for himself,—it was through the reception of these truths, that the man of whom we are speaking, found mercy of God, was renewed in the spirit of his mind, and made fit for the inheritance of the saints in light. And thus must we act if we desire to be partakers of glory, honor and immortality. O my fellow sinner, you will never be immortal except through the Lamb, who was "wounded for your transgressions and bruised for your iniquities." "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ,"—that he loved *you* and gave himself for *you*—"and thou shalt be saved."—Remember that by waging this controversy with popular error, we wish to gain *your* conversion to God, and if that is not effected our labor is so far fruitless. You may be convinced perhaps that none but the holy in Jesus will be immortal; but what will that avail you, should you continue in sin and are not added to the throng of the deathless. This moment come to the Lamb, who is waiting to receive yon and to write your name in the book of Life.

3d. *The end of the wicked is death.* This is the everlasting punishment to be inflicted on them at the final day. While the text is a sure and delightful promise of eternal life, to men in Christ, it is a no less certain announcement of destruction to the godless. "Because I live ye shall live also," he says to his friends: "Because I live ye shall surely die," is addressed to his enemies. His life then is a guarantee of immortal being to the one class; and of death to be inflicted by his power on the other. O think of the doom, and that it is inevitable if you receive not the sanctifying gospel, that he loved you and gave himself for you. "The soul that sinneth it shall die." Flee from the wrath to come, and flee now,—the next moment may be a moment too late. Infinite love implores you to escape the path of ruin. With open arms the blessed Redeemer waits to receive you as you are, and to give you all the mercies and felicity that his word reveals. O come and live for ever.

## BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

We design to keep constantly on hand the following works on the grand gospel truth of "*Immortality for man only in Christ*," and let a new effort be made to place them in every house in the land.

1. SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT, by *H. H. Dobney*, Baptist Minister, England; 286 pages, 12mo. It is a most luminous defence of the truth that *immortality* is to be possessed *only* by a union with Christ. *Price* 75 cents, bound; or 50 in paper covers, suitable to be sent by mail.

2. DIALOGUES ON FUTURE PUNISHMENT, by *Rev. Wm. Glen Moncrieff*, Scotland. A most valuable and convincing work, which ought to be in the hands of every person where the gospel is preached. It is a pamphlet of 60 pages, 12mo. *Price*, 15 cents.

3. THE UNITY OF MAN, OR LIFE AND DEATH REALITIES. A REPLY TO REV. LUTHER LEE, by *Anthropos*. This is a thorough refutation of Mr. Lee's position of the natural immortality of man's fancied "immortal soul." It contains 122 pages, 18mo., in paper covers. *Price* 15 cents.

4. SIX SERMONS, by *Geo. Storrs*: An inquiry, *Are the wicked Immortal?* to which is *added*, a dissertation on the State of the Dead; and *prefixed* Archbishop Whately's remarks on *The Second Death!* Thousands of copies have been scattered abroad. The work will speak for itself. It has 128 pages, 18mo., in paper covers. *Price* 15 *cents.*

5. STORRS' MISCELLANY.—This contains the Six Sermons—Unity of Man—Rich man and Lazarus—Second Death, by Whately—Can you believe? by Moncrieff—The Two Thrones, by Geo. Storrs, and the inquiry, Have the Dead Knowledge? bound in *one volume*, making 275 pages. Price 42 cents.

6. THE IMMATERIALITY OF THE SOUL, by *Thomas Read*, New York.—This is a Pamphlet of 24 pages, 12mo., in covers. A most complete exposure of the unphilosophical and unscriptural notion that the soul is Immaterial. *Price*, 7 centssingle; or $4 per hundred.

7. OUR ISRAELITISH ORIGIN, or *Lectures on Ancient Israel*, by J. Wilson, England. This work has no connection with the others in the foregoing list, but is designed to show that the modern inhabitants of Europé, and the people of the United States, are the literal descendants of Jacob, and of the lost tribes of Israel. It is deeply interesting, and should be read carefully by all. *Price* 75 cents, bound, or 50 in paper covers.

*One Third* discount will be made on each of the foregoing works from the retail price to those who buy to sell again, provided they take at least *three* dollars worth at a time, and send *the cash* with the order.

8. BOUND EXAMINERS.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | 1848 & 1849, in one volume, | $1 50 |
| 2. | '49 & '50, " " " | 1 50 |
| 3. | '48, '49 & '50 " " | 2 25 |
| 4. | 1850 alone, " " | 1 25 |

From these prices 25 cents will be deducted on either volume to paying subscribers for 1851. Of Nos. 1 & 3 we have but a few copies left; those will be sold to such as first send the money for them; and it is the last chance for any ever to procure the Examiner for 1848.

None of these works can be sent out on *commission:* and our pecuniary circumstances compel us to do business *for cash*, except in cases of *special* agreement, which can be entered into only with such as will give satisfaction of not disappointing us.

All orders or communications should be addressed

GEORGE STORRS, *Philadelphia*, Pa.

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VI. PHILADELPHIA, FEBRUARY, 1851. No. 2.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,

AT 198 MARSHALL STREET, THIRD DOOR ABOVE BROWN,

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, one dollar; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; ALWAYS IN ADVANCE.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

## D. N. LORD—H. H. DOBNEY.

We informed our readers, three months since, that David N. Lord, of "The Theological and Literary Journal," had announced a "Review of H. H. Dobney's Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment." We looked for it with deep interest, from the known ability of Mr. Lord, and expected something of unusual value, but have been sadly disappointed. It bears no comparison with Mr. Hinton's in England, which we noticed some eighteen months since. Were it not for Mr. Lord's reputation, we should pass his article, and leave it entirely to Mr. Dobney, if he should be disposed to review it.

To us Mr. Lord has not one new argument; and the general topics he has touched upon have been answered again and again: yet it may be best that we should not pass him in silence. We never endorsed every expression in Mr. Dobney's work, yet, as a whole, it is excellent, and powerfully conclusive. This is evident from the manner in which Mr. Lord has met it. He has only approached some of the outposts, and fancying that he has carried these, he winds up with a solemn *warning* against Mr. Dobney's "work as one of the most mistaken, and one of the most dangerous." He has left Mr. Dobney's stronghold untouched; and one cannot help thinking he was so much afraid of the "most dangerous work," that he never obtained sight of anything but an outpost or two, and in his fright left the field. Sure we are, we never saw a more total failure: and his attempt to frighten men from reading Mr. Dobney's work adds nothing to his theological reputation.

Mr. Lord admits, at the outset, that the soul is not "constitutionally imperishable," and he denies that such is the "dogma of the orthodox." But we will let him speak and the Examiner reply, and thus take the form of a dialogue.

LORD.—"To suppose that the soul is imperishable or indestructible, by virtue of its nature or the constitution it has received, is to suppose that it is endowed with a self-existing nature, which is a solecism. No created being can have the ground of its being in itself. To imagine the soul to be now self-existent, were to imagine that its nature forms an indisputable proof that it never owed its existence to creation. For, if it now has its being independently of its creator, how can it be shown it had not at any former period?"—p. 396.

EXAMINER.—We thank you for your assent to this truth. Luther Lee maintains, in his work "on the soul," that "it is a simple essence, *uncompounded*, indivisible and indestructible." If this were so, it must be *uncreated*, and owes not its existence to a Creator. We are glad, therefore, that you have spoken out distinctly on this point, as the "orthodox," many of them, have endorsed and commended Mr. Lee's work, though you say you "should be surprised to learn that" such a doctrine "is taught in any theological school in this country or in England."

LORD.—"The fact, however, that the soul is not by its nature, or constitutionally, indestructible, is no proof whatever that it is not to exist forever."—p. 397.

EXR.—But it is "proof that it" *may* "*not* exist forever," for God "is ABLE to destroy" it.

LORD.—"Its continuing to exist depends on God's continuing to uphold it. The question whether it is to exist for ever or not, is the question whether or not he designs to uphold it for ever."—p. 397.

EXR.—We are glad you see what the question is, because it may yet lead you to see the truth that "all the wicked will God destroy—they shall be as the fat of lambs; into smoke shall they consume away." On the "*inherent immortality* of man" what have you to say?

LORD.—Mr. Dobney "has not shed any new light on the subject, and will not find any, we presume, in this country or Great Britain, entitled to be regarded as theologians, who do not entertain essentially the views he advances respecting it."—p. 397.

EXR.—It gives us pleasure to learn there has been such a general conversion of "theologians" in "this country and Great Britain." How long have they held "essentially the views which" Mr. Dobney "advances respecting it?" Surely it cannot be long. It is twenty-five years since we entered the ministry; most of that time we were in the "orthodox" school, and had some little opportunity

to know what "theologians" held on that subject, and are quite sure if they now hold, as you affirm, "*essentially* the views" of Mr. Dobney on "*inherent immortality*" they must have had a conversion within the last twelve or fifteen years. But we let that pass. We hope you are correct in your statement. If so, we shall expect to see a still further advance toward the truth among them.

* * * * * *

LORD.—"The ground on which" Mr. Dobney "proceeds is, in fact, equivalent to the assumption that the Most High cannot punish his offending subjects, unless it be done from a mere malignant and cruel delight in their suffering; not in order to the manifestation of his rectitude, the maintenance of his rights, and the support of his government over his other subjects."—p. 399.

EXR.—This is a mere "assumption." Let us state the matter in accordance with our interpretation of Mr. Dobney's words. It would stand thus: "The ground on which Mr. Dobney proceeds is, that the Most High, who has sworn, '*As I live, I have no pleasure in the* DEATH *of the wicked*,' CANNOT purposely prolong their existence eternally in order to *torment* them; and that neither the 'manifestation of his rectitude, the maintenance of his rights, nor the support of his government' require such a procedure; while he may truly and justly *punish* them with death—or a dying out of existence—which he has affixed as the wages of sin."

Had you taken this view of Mr. Dobney's remarks, which is the true and scriptural view, you would have been saved the greater part of your labor. No sane man ever doubted the right and necessity of *punishment* in certain cases; but no man ever lived, whose reason was uncorrupted, but what has often doubted the necessity and the justice of *eternal torture*. Punishment may be *with* or *without* torture. None ought to be so ignorant as not to know that punishment and torment are not necessarily identical. The eternal deprivation of life is *as truly* an eternal punishment as eternal life in torture. We have so fully argued this point before that we will not stop now to enlarge upon it, but simply say, that all you have said about "everlasting *punishment*" being "in precise accordance with" sinners' "offences," is beating the air.

LORD.—Mr. Dobney "*must prove*, in order to maintain his doctrine, that though God may with perfect righteousness and wisdom uphold and punish" [*i. e., torture*] "them for ever, yet he would display still greater wisdom and goodness in their annihilation."—p. 401.

EXR.—Mr. Dobney has no occasion for any such thing. All he need to prove, and all he attempts, is, that God has spoken in no equivocal terms, that the wicked *shall not live for ever*. You have not disproved that position; and we are filled with astonishment, that such an advocate as yourself, for a literal interpretation of scripture, should so fatally have gone astray on testimony so plain as to the end of the wicked.

LORD.—"It is *apparent* that their extinction might give rise to the most fatal consequences to the rest of the universe."—p. 401.

EXR.—Pray tell us what are those "fatal" things?

LORD.—It would indicate "an inability [in God] to reign over them and rule them forever in revolt,"—"it would form an indisputable proof that he was unequal to his station"—"it would be to weaken his sway over *the holy*, and render it IMPOSSIBLE *to them unreservedly to* ADORE *and* TRUST *him*"!—p. 402.

EXR.—Truly these are most marvellous assumptions, and though they may be very "*apparent*" to your mind, you have not given evidence to "prove" them, at all, except additional assumptions are proof. What an idea is this—If God should destroy—or as you say, annihilate—the wicked, it would "weaken his sway over *the holy*"!! Yea, "Render it *impossible* to them * * to *adore* and *trust* him"!! Such remarks need no comment. If God does what he has said he would do, *viz:* "destroy all the wicked," will not that be, so far as that point is concerned, a sufficient reason to trust and adore him?

LORD.—"It would be to furnish Satan with an excuse for his rebellion, and enable him to BOAST that he had triumphed over the Almighty, by putting him under the necessity of showing that he is incapable of governing rebellious subjects in a way that is worthy of a perfectly wise and good being, and of demonstrating thereby that he is entitled to the homage he claims; that his law is, therefore, infinitely unjust, and the *penalty* with which he enforces it unrighteous; and thence that instead of being supremely holy, just, and good, he is immeasurably unholy and malevolent, and that consequently that all his subjects are absolved from allegiance to him."—p. 402.

EXR.—"Great is Diana of the" immortal-soulists! Such assumptions as you have given us are truly marvellous. "Satan *boast*" when all his armies are "annihilated"!!! What a "*triumph*"! Satan must have nearly as many expedients to put darkness for light as yourself, if he "boasts" under such a loss. But "The *penalty*" of God's law is "unrighteous," you say, if he "annihilates" the wicked!! Another terrible matter! What if that "*penalty*" should prove to be "*death*"—to "be as though they had not been." Obadiah 16. Prove that it is not, if you can: sure we are you have not done it.

This assumption might be turned back upon your own theory, for, according to that, Satan may eternally "*boast*" that he has unnumbered millions of the creatures of God under his banner who never will pay their Creator homage, and can eternally send up as many curses against God as the redeemed can shout praises, and so have a sort of "*opposition* line," which certainly would seem to

be some satisfaction to his Satanic majesty. But we forbear pursuing a theory so infinitely absurd.

We will pass over your long paragraph of stupendous *fiction*, p. 403; telling us how completely Satan would carry out his designs to "overturn the divine government," in case the wicked are all literally destroyed.

LORD.—"The annihilation of the wicked, because of an inability to uphold and govern them without an exhibition of imperfection, would yield him [Satan] such a victory [overturn the divine government] in the most decisive form."—p. 403.

EXR.—Mr. Dobney does not maintain, as you unjustly *insinuate*, that God destroys "the wicked *because* of an INABILITY to uphold and govern them;" and the insinuation is unworthy of you. You ought to know, if you have read Dobney's work, that he treats the whole subject on the ground of the evidence of what God has said he *will do*. Let the question be met truly, and not raise, as you have done, a false issue. Has God said—"*The soul that sinneth* IT *shall die?*" and is that death cessation of conscious existence? You will find we are not to be bewildered with a cloud of dust—assumptions and insinuations. Stand up like a man, and show from the testimony of God's own word, that the wicked shall NOT "*consume*, into smoke consume away:" Psa. 37: 20. Show that God has not said, they shall be "burned *up*"—so that they shall be consumed "ROOT AND BRANCH:" Mal. 4: 1. Show that the "penalty" of God's law is *endless life* in unmitigated woe. Till you have done this you cannot satisfy men who think, and do not let a multitude of *words* carry them away.

LORD.—"In order to a full apprehension of what God does in saving those whom he saves, a full manifestation must be presented of what they would have been, had they been left to perish; and the conservation of the wicked for ever, will be requisite in order to that."—p. 404.

EXR.—How do you know that? You have given us no "*Thus saith the Lord*": it is all *assumption*.

LORD.—"The possibilities of exemplifying the great facts of their character, and God's right and power, will not be exhausted in a limited period. The developements and process will go on through eternal ages. Thus it will be seen, by such a practical experiment, that they are truly such enemies as God represents them."—p. 404.

EXR.—So it seems God is to keep sinners alive eternally and torture them to make the holy and saved believe that he speaks the truth when he "*represents* them as his enemies!" Marvellous, truly! The holy cannot be satisfied by any representation God can make, that sinners are sinners unless Jehovah exerts his almighty power in holding them in life, and thus perpetuating sin and blasphemy, in order by "*a practical experiment*" to demonstrate that they are "such enemies as God represents them"! And all this, *mark*, AFTER the day of judgment has passed, and He has pronounced a formal sentence of condemnation upon them. Just about as much force in your argument here, as if a judge after having passed the sentence of *death* upon a murderer, should add—"the criminal must be kept alive and have a chance to murder more, in order to give a practical experiment, that he is a murderer"! We confess, we are amazed at your position on this subject.

LORD.—By this "practical experiment it will be seen that no measures of punishment are adequate to reform them; but, that in the certain prospect of INTERMINABLE MISERY, they go on deliberately and incorrigibly in alienation and rebellion."—p 404.

EXR.—Will you be honest enough to own that you, and all of your school, maintain that those "measurs of punishment" are not calculated nor intended for *reformation*? and that "*reform*," however thorough it might be, would not entitle them to the favor of God? that their doom is unalterably fixed? that God neither asks nor expects them to reform? nay—that their "interminable misery" is "*certain*"! Pray, what inducement to reform?—None at all. Where, then, is the "practical experiment"? Manifestly no where but in an imagination that is Don Quixotical in the extreme.

LORD.—"There are ample reasons for the belief that their conservation and punishment through an endless existence, are ESSENTIAL to his [God's] rectitude, and INDISPENSABLE to the *well-being* of his *obedient kingdom*."—p. 405.

EXR.—If there are "ample reasons" you have utterly failed to make them appear to our mind; and we believe you have equally so to all impartial minds. We must insist upon it, that such wild assumptions dishonor God; and if believed, cannot fail to lead men to abhor him and his government, as far more defective than that of Nero, or any other tyrant that ever outraged human nature. What! God, who has sworn by himself, "as I live, I have no pleasure in the DEATH *of the wicked*," find it "*essential* to his rectitude, and *indispensable* to the WELL-BEING of his obedient kingdom," to preserve *alive* eternally, for a "practical experiment" in "misery," souls that he has made! Perish the blasphemous thought! Perish, and perish quickly, the soul-destroying INFLUENCE of such blasphemy! May God, in mercy, forgive those who utter it. We trust they do it "ignorantly in unbelief."

LORD.—"The life promised, and to be bestowed on the saved, is not a bare, unending existence, but an endless life in the *body*, in such a relationship to God, acceptance and bliss, as Adam would have enjoyed, had he continued in allegiance and obtained justification. It is a perfect deliverance from the curse brought upon himself and his posterity, by his rebellion, and gift of a life in an immortal body, such as have been the reward of obedience. This is clear from the fact that the death that was inflicted on him as the penalty of his fall, was the death of the body."—p. 405—6.

EXR.—Here is the root of your error. You assume that when God threatened Adam—THE MAN—with *death*, he only meant *the shell*—the outside covering—should drop off! "*The body*" is all that dies, you say; but not one particle of evidence have you given from God's word to sustain your assumption. What do you say?

LORD.—"It was not an extinction of his soul, as that would have been an annihilation of his being, and made a subsequent existence and resurrection impossible."—p. 406.

EXR.—Here you undertake to tell what the Almighty cannot do. But we let that pass for the present. In this paragraph, you attempt to blind the mind. Just as though a soul could not be placed in a state of utter unconsciousness, without being absolutely "*extinct*"! Any schoolboy knows by very many "*practical experiments*" that he can be entirely unconscious and not be "extinct" nor "annihilated." We retort upon you. If the soul does not die with the body there can be no "subsequent existence," nor "resurrection" of *the man*. There can be no *subsequent* existence, because there has been no *interruption* of the existence of *the man*. There can be no "resurrection" of the man, because the man has never been dead; without death first, "resurrection" is impossible."

LORD.—"Had he [man] been annihilated *he* could not be recalled into existence."—p. 406.

EXR.—Who has maintained that the death penalty to Adam was annihilation? Surely Mr. Dobney has not; nor have any of us who are with him in his views in America. But our opponents delight in exaggeration, and so fix on an odious term, that *sound* may cover up the defects of their arguments. Know then, that to be *unconscious* in death, and to be "*annihilated*" are two very different things. Because you may not see how the *identity* is preserved in a state of unconsciousness, shall you sit in judgment on the Almighty, and tell what is "impossible" with him? We may answer you in the words of our Lord Jesus Christ: "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the *power* of God."

LORD.—"In order to the *possibility* of a resurrection the soul must survive, and death accordingly be CONFINED TO THE BODY."—p. 406.

EXR.—Again we retort upon you. You have just said, "had he [the man] been annihilated *he* could not be recalled into existence." Now, if death be *confined to the body*," "*he*" [the man] cannot be "recalled into existence," because "*he*" was never *out* of "existence;" and, "*he* cannot have a resurrection"—*that* is an *im*"possibility;" for "he" was never dead. Who gave you authority to affirm that "*he*"—the man—does not die? and that death is "confined to the body? Where is your "*Thus saith the Lord*" for this bold *assumption*?

LORD.—"As all mankind, who die, are to be raised to another life, the death universally that is brought on them by the fall of the first parent, is a death *merely* of the body."—p. 406.

EXR.—Then, the moment Adam died—or rather his body was dead—he must be in a blessed state; for the penalty of sin was the "death of the body *merely*." The penalty did not touch his soul, according to your assumption. Adam needed no Redeemer except to redeem his "body *merely*"!

LORD.—"The life, consequently, which as the counterpart of *that death*, is a life in an immortal body."—p. 406.

EXR.—Well, then, "all mankind," you say "are to be raised to another life." Will they all be raised with this "counterpart—an *immortal body*?" You expressly affirm, p. 406, that "the impenitent are to be *raised immortal*;" though you do so without any authority from the Bible. If so, how are you to escape the conclusion of a universal salvation?

LORD.—"On the other hand, not to see life, is not to be annihilated any more than the death of the body was annihilation."—p. 406.

EXR.—You seemingly take pleasure in following Mr. Dobney with the term "*annihilation*." You define annihilation—"to strike out of existence."—p. 417. You have said the "*body*" dies. When it is dead it has no existence as a *living body*; it had once, but it has not now. Then it is "struck out of a living existence," and is annihilated in this sense, you being judge. Then, *not* to "see life" may be annihilation, for all you can show to the contrary.

LORD.—"It is not to see *that life* of immortality which is the reward of obedience, but to continue under the curse of sin."—p. 406.

EXR.—"But "the curse of sin" is *death*, for "the wages of sin is death." Rom. 6: 23.

LORD.—"He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him. As he must continue to subsist in order to its abiding on him, his not seeing life cannot be his annihilation, but his still being debarred from the blessing of obedience and subjected to the penalty of sin."—p. 406.

EXR.—It is truly refreshing, Br. Lord, that you have at last condescended to look at the Bible. We have followed you through *eleven* pages of your "Review," and believe this is the first time you have quoted a passage of inspiration to sustain your position. Truly this text is as cold water to a thirsty soul; we have travelled after you through a *desert*, and are really refreshed to find a spring of water at last, but are sorry to find you "fouling it" so soon with immortal-soulism. This does not look much like your accustomed valor for *literalism*. You *assume* that the sinner must continue to subsist in order to the wrath of God abiding on him. Do the "cities of the plains" continue to subsist? Where is Sodom and Gomorrah? Does not the wrath of God abide on those devoted cities? Yea,

because wrath abideth on them they *are not*—are "annihilated," if you please. God is his own expositor; and he assures us, Isa. 57: 16, if he should "be always wroth, the *spirit* would *fail* before" him, "and the *souls*" he has "made:" clearly implying, that if the wrath of God *abides* on any man, without being withdrawn, he must perish, "or cease from existence." But you say, "he must continue to subsist"—and be "subjected to the penalty of sin." The penalty of sin is *death:* and you might as well tell us that the murderer must continue to live, in order to the wrath of the law abiding on him. If he continue to live, the wrath of the law, or penalty of it, would not be *upon* him; and of course could not *abide* on him. But when he is executed, he is dead, and the wrath of the violated law abides on him; but it would not if he could live again. So if the wrath of God abides on any soul of man, he must not only receive the wages of sin, *viz.*, "death," but *abide* under its dominion, and "not *see life:*" he lives no more eternally. The text you quote requires this construction, and can have no other without abandoning *literalism.* What have you to say on the text—"Our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death and brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel?" 2 Tim. 1: 9, 10.

LORD.—"The death which he abolished is the death of the body. He abolishes that death which was brought on the race of Adam, and that was the death of the body. 'As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive.' But that death which all suffer by Adam is the death of the body."—p. 407.

EXR.—That death which all suffer by Adam is the death of THE MAN: it was *the man*, who was threatened with death, and not man's body merely. According to your theory, Christ redeems not *the man* from death—he merely redeems "*the body;*" and the soul "subsists" without any of Christ's work, mediation, or suffering. A small matter truly to be the Redeemer of *bodies* only, and that after *the man* proper has been in conscious existence, in some cases, thousands of years without a body! Truly you narrow down the work of redemption to a very unimportant point. We are agreed in the fact, that it was the death by Adam that Christ abolishes, or abrogates; but that death was the death of *the man;* and was not "confined to the body," as you have affirmed.

LORD.—"The life and immortality which Christ brought to light by the gospel, is not a life and perpetual existence of the soul * * * but a life and immortality of the body, the antithesis of that death to which the race was subjected by Adam."—p. 408.

EXR.—We agree that it is "the antithesis of" the "death by Adam;" but we by no means admit your assumption that it was not "life and perpetual existence."

LORD.—"The term in the passage in question *aphtharsian*, translated immortality, in fact denotes incorruptibleness simply,—not *athanasian*, immortality, or deathlessness, which is its literal meaning."—p. 408.

EXR.—We are glad to hear you talk of "*literal* meaning." Pray will you tell us if an "*incorruptible*" being is not an immortal being? and if any stronger term could be employed to denote "perpetual existence" than to affirm that being to be "*incorruptible?*" God is called "the incorruptible God;" Rom. 1: 23. Does that express, or not, "perpetual existence?" That being who is incorruptible must, in the nature of the case possess perpetual existence.

LORD.—"Being cast into a lake of fire, is the *symbol* of the punishment the impenitent are to suffer after their resurrection; and as they are to be *raised immortal*, the unquenchableness of the fire and the deathlessness of their worm, indicate that their punishment is never to end;—not that they are reduced to nothingness, or struck out of being."—p. 409.

EXR.—Here you assume the very point to be proved; *viz.*, that the "impenitent are to be *raised immortal.*" Not one particle of proof have you of this position from Genesis to Revelation: and we challenge you to give us one text that affirms any such thing. You stumble at the very threshhold. Paul affirms—"He that soweth to the flesh, shall of the flesh reap *corruption*," not immortality; Gal. 6: 8: and they shall *utterly perish* in their own corruption." 2 Peter 2: 12.

LORD.—"Mark 9: 43—48 confutes Mr. Dobney's theory . . as the immortality of the worm and the inextinguishableness of the fire show the endlessness of the existence and punishment of the wicked in place of indicating as he assumes their annihilation. His construction exhibits the perpetuity of the instruments of punishment as needless and absurd."—p. 410.

EXR.—"*Annihilation*" seems to haunt you as it does nearly all our opponents; but we will attend to that point when we come to your definition of the term. You talk of of the "perpetuity of the instruments of punishment as needless and absurd" on Mr. Dobney's theory. Mr. D. does not contemplate the "perpetuity of the instruments;" that is an *absurdity* of your own. You know, or may know that the reference in Mark 9; 43—48, is to the "fire of Gehenna," and that whatever was cast therein was consumed—*utterly consumed*—either by the fire, or the worm preying upon it. The figure, therefore, has the sense of total destruction, without escape; and it can have no other, unless we give the "*absurd*" one of perpetuating, or *preserving*; for which there is no analogy in nature in reason, nor in the word of God. Examine carefully the following texts, and the *absurdity* of your position will be apparent; 2 Chron. 34: 25. Jer. 7: 20, and 17: 27; Ezk. 20: 47, 48; Isa. 34: 9–12.

LORD,—"Mr. Dobney holds that a resurrection is to be a restoration to *existence*, and thence regards the second death as another annihilation."—p. 410.

EXR.—"Mr. Dobney holds" no such thing. He says—"We have reason to believe that the death threatened to Adam was the death of the entire man, the cessation of all conscious existence, which would *have been* his doom, *had it not been for the* MEDIATORIAL *work of the* SECOND ADAM." He does not say, nor intimate, that such is *actually* the case in the death through Adam; but that such would have been the result but for the *mediation* of the second Adam. In the first death there is a *suspension* of life, but not an "annihilation," in the sense you employ that term. The *final* is not arrived at till after the judgment of men for their personal conduct; then, those who have rejected life are left to the *full* penalty of the law, which is death; yea, Br. Lord, "*annihilated*," so that "they shall be as though they had not been."—Obadiah, 16.

LORD.—"A resurrection is not a creation. It is a change of a subject that already existed from one state of being to another."—p. 413.

EXR.—Very true; it is "a change" from "sleeping in the dust of the earth" to a *conscious* state of existence, which they had not while dead; for, "the dead know not anything" and "there is *no knowledge* in she'ol"—the state of the dead: hence the necessity of a resurrection: and Paul saith, "If the dead rise not . . then they also that have fallen asleep in Christ are perished." See 1 Corth. 15: 16—18, 32. If your theory be true *the man* is not dead, and the resurrection of *the man* is impossible; that which is not dead cannot have a resurrection; so your view denies Christ the honor of raising *men* from the dead, and confers upon him only the amazing glory of raising up *carcases* which some had put off ten, a hundred, a thousand, or thousands of years since; and without which they have been triumphing in glory! One would think it was no great blessing for them to return to earth for "*bodies*" now.

LORD.—"The punishment foreshown Rev. 14: 9, 11, is indisputably the last punishment that is to be inflicted on those who are its subjects: for it is to continue for ever and ever. But *all the wicked* that have died before the resurrection of the wicked will then be raised, and subjected to *precisely* this kind of punishment."—p. 416.

EXR.—That is, the worshipers of the beast are threatened to be punished "*precisely*" as any other, and "*all*" other sinners are! Surely, the formal manner in which judgment is denounced on this class of sinners, totally forbids the construction you put upon it. It is most manifest the punishment is something peculiar, and to take place "*on the earth.*" See the following chapters; particularly the 15th and 16th. The figures employed are nearly of the same character as those in Isa. 34, where evidently the Lord is speaking of an infliction of judgment this side "the last"

LORD.—"Mr. Dobney has nothing left for the support of his doctrine, except the words, *destroy, destruction*, and others of the like import, used in describing the punishment of the wicked, which he holds are synonymous with *annihilation*. The terms, however, are not of the same, nor even of a *resembling* import. To *annihilate* is to strike out of existence. But to destroy is only to *change* the mode or condition of existence in such manner as to disqualify, disable, or prevent that which is destroyed, from the condition or end for which it was designed. When for example, a city is said to be destroyed by a siege or an earthquake, the meaning is not that the *substances* of which it is built are *annihilated*, but that they are so changed in condition and relationship, that they are no longer applicable to the *uses for which they were erected*. There may be vast remains of walls, temples . . . and other structures, that may continue to stand for ages almost without dilapidation. Yet the city is said to be destroyed, because it is so marred and demolished as to prevent it from being used for the purpose for which it was designed—and such is its meaning *generally*. . . . This is the etymological meaning also of the corresponding Hebrew, Greek, and Latin verbs. Thus *destructo*, from which *destroy* is derived, signifies to *pull down, separate into parts*, or reduce to disorder and ruin. When applied to *corporeal beings individually*, it denotes their being marred, mutilated, or *disorganized*, so as to unfit them for their proper functions as *living beings*, and usually their being *killed*, or the separation of the two great constituents of their being, the body and the *psuche*, the life principle or conscious nature. . . . It does not imply, therefore that they are to be ANNIHILATED, *nor does the language admit of* SUCH A MEANING. Its import is as remote and diverse from it as disorganization or demolition applied to an organized body is from annihilation. Their *everlasting existence* is, in truth, an INDISPENSABLE *condition of their everlasting* DESTRUCTION. The last ground on which Mr. Dobney attempts to sustain his doctrine, is thus swept from beneath him."—pp. 417, 418.

EXAMINER.—If *words* could "sweep" it away, and *dust* could cover up truth, we confess we should think Mr. Dobney's "ground" in danger. But after listening to the report of this last, and heaviest discharge of your "theological" engine; and after waiting a little to let the *steam* clear away, we march up to the track where Mr. Dobney had taken his stand, and we find not a *rail* removed, nor a *timber* jostled from its sure foundation; and none need fear to take the same *car* and travel the *same road* that Mr. Dobney was so quietly traveling, when this *explosion* took place from your engine.

In the first place, we will test your *assumption* that the terms, destroy and annihilate, are not of a "*resembling*" import; and that "destroy" does "not admit of such a meaning" as "annihilation." It is true, you have a right to give the sense in which *you* use words; but *you* are a *standard only for yourself*. On the term, "Destroy," Dr. Webster

in his Dictionary, gives the following, among other definitions: "2. To ruin; to *annihilate* a thing by demolishing, or burning; as, to *destroy* a city." Thus, Br. Lord, "a city" may be "*annihilated,*" though there may be "*remains.*" Again Dr. Webster says: "3. To ruin; to *bring to naught;* to ANNIHILATE; as, to *destroy* a theory or scheme; to destroy a government," &c. Does this look as though "a government" must have "*everlasting existence,*" to be *everlastingly destroyed?*" Once more, Dr. Webster says: "5. To kill, to slay, to *extirpate; applied to men, or other animals.* Ye shall *destroy* all this people.—Num. 32. All the wicked will God *destroy.* Psa. 145." "To extirpate," one would think, has a "*resembling* import," to "*annihilate.*" Finally, Dr. W. says,—"8. In *general,* to put an end to; to ANNIHILATE," &c.

Such are some of the definitions Dr. Webster gives of the term "destroy." He may not, however, be so great a *scholar* as yourself; at any rate you may dissent from him, if you choose; but we will now leave Dr. Webster, and look a little into the "Hebrew;" to which you appeal, without, however, giving us a single example, that the "*corresponding*" word in that language has no "*resembling* import." Aaron Pick, Professor of Hebrew and Chaldee, from the University of Prague, in his "Bible Students' Concordance," in which the "*Literal* meaning" of any word in the "Sacred Oracles" can be found by the "English Reader," gives us thirty-eight different, original words, which are rendered *destroy,* destroyed, destruction, &c. It will be sufficient to "*sweep from beneath*" you, your *assumption* of no "resembling import" between the terms destroy and annihilation, to show that the *literal* import of one of those words is annihilation; and that it occurs in prophecies which relate to the final destiny of wicked men. The word to which we refer, is "*Tsomath*"—literally, says Prof. Pick, "*to annihilate.*" Among other places where it occurs in "Hebrew," is Psa. 18: 40, where "David in Spirit" saith, "Thou hast also given me the necks of mine enemies, that I might *destroy—tsomath—annihilate* them that hate me." Corresponding with this, our Lord saith, when he shall return, having received the kingdom, he will command—"bring hither those *mine enemies,* which would not that I should reign over them, and *slay* them before me." Lk. 19: 27.

Once more: Psa. 101: 8, "I will early *destroy—tsomath—annihilate* ALL *the wicked* of the land, that I may cut off all wicked doers from the city of the LORD." Here is another prophecy of what Messiah *will do.* How far the "Hebrew" sustains your *assumption* of no "resembling import" we submit to those who judge between you and us. Annihilation is a term we have never used, simply because we supposed it was not a *scripture* term. We are now satisfied it is, and shall not scruple to use it hereafter, and thereby boldly meet our opponents on their own ground; thus our warfare shall be *aggressive.* The term "immortal soul," is *not* scriptural; and does not once occur in the English, Greek nor Hebrew in the Bible; and has no "*resembling*" words except these.—"*Ye shall not surely die.*" But these came from him, who is a "liar, and the *father of lies;*" and here we leave you and all your adherents, in hope that you may by serious reflection, prayer to God for a teachable heart, and a further disenthralment, yet come to the truth, and as nobly defend it as you have some other scripture doctrines. Wishing that the God of peace and truth may lead you and ourself into all truth, we now take leave of you, and leave Mr. Dobney to take up the subject if he pleases.

---

"THE SPIRIT MESSENGER."—That paper is among the "*ghosts*" that hide themselves. Not a number has made its appearance at our office since we gave it the gentle "*knocking*" in December.

---

"THE SPIRITUAL PHILOSOPHER."—Its name has been changed to "*The Spirit World.*" The new name is very appropriate. We judge several of the last numbers of the "Philosopher" went into "*the spirit world,*" for they kept out of our sight, and never looked inside our office at all. Perhaps we have too much "*material,*" or "*matter,*" to suit their *taste.* However, we will be just as civil to them as *truth* will allow us to be. We shall look into "The Spirit World" when it comes this way. "The Spiritual Philosopher" has proved itself a *Philosopher* indeed; for it has brought "The Spirit World" to the gaze of *material* eyes; yes, to the eyes of the most *animal* man, who will pay "a dollar;" and, once in a while, to "*we*" editors by way of "*exchange.*"

---

"DIALOGUE *on the Question of the Separate Existence of the Soul.*"—This is the title of a "Tract of 32 octavo pages," published at the Advent Watchman office, Hartford, Conn. Price, $6 per 100. Ten cents single. We have not yet found time to read it, and cannot therefore, speak of its value.

---

"THE AGE OF GOSPEL LIGHT: or, *the Immortality of man, only through Jesus Christ; given by him at the Resurrection of the Just:* BY Z. CAMPBELL." This is a Pamphlet of 32 pages, octavo, published at Hartford, Conn. Price, with covers, $6 per 100; ten cents single. Without covers, $3 per 100; five cents single. Orders to be directed to J. Turner, or Agent of Advent Watchman. We are

sorry to say, we have been compelled to defer its examination till we can get over the crowd that has been upon us since we received a copy. We presume it is good.

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, FEBRUARY, 1851.

To CORRESPONDENTS.—We have to crave their forbearance. Our time has been so completely occupied in various matters demanding our attention, that we are compelled to put off attention to many suggestions and *questions*, which have been sent us. Our present paper will show that we have not been idle in writing. Some will find their questions answered in *fact*, though not in *form*, in some of the articles in this number of the Examiner.

---

ENGLISH CORRESPONDENCE.—The following Letter from Br. Dobney will be read, we doubt not, with interest. We hope it will be followed by many more, and trust it will; not only from him but others also in that country. Our Correspondents may be assured they are none the less welcome to our columns because they may not see all points of doctrine as we do. We may be in error in some things, but feel it will be a privilege to change error for truth at any time; and trust to be always ready to do so when convinced by Scripture argument. We regard *immortality*, or *endless life*, ONLY in Jesus Christ, as the great foundation truth of the gospel, around which all other truths cluster, and from which they all radiate. In short—That Jesus Christ, the Son of the living God, is "*all and in all*" to his followers, for present salvation from sin, and future life, immortality, *and endless existence*. Any doctrine that detracts from this grand gospel truth we regard as error, from whatever source it proceeds.

LETTER FROM H. H. DOBNEY.

*Maidstone*, England, Dec. 4th 1850.

*My Dear Sir*,—I think it was in May last, a copy of the "Bible Examiner" direct from America, was brought to me as I lay on a sick bed. My illness prevented me from at once acknowledging the kindness of the sender, whom I presumed to be yourself, and when I had recovered my health the copy was mislaid, so that I was reluctantly compelled to seem indifferent to my unknown friend. Having recently been favoured with another Number, I avail myself of the first lesiure hour at my disposal, to return you my heartiest thanks, and to express the pleasure which has been occasioned me by much of what is contained in the two numbers of the periodical named.

In all your endeavors to promote the glory of God and the true interests of man, by the correction of error and the propagation of truth, may God abundantly bless you. And may grace be with all who love our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, whatever peculiarities of theological opinion now unhappily keep them asunder.

It is matter for congratulation that the attention of the American churches is being called to the solemn question which the "Bible Examiner" seems especially established to keep before the public mind. May truth, so much the more, and so much the purer, be the happy result of the discussion.

I know many ministers of Evangelical sentiment, here in England, who more than doubt of the correctness of the common orthodox belief on this momentous subject. And while, no doubt, a vast amount of prejudice still remains, deterring many minds from examining the question, and leading them doggedly to abide, whether or no, by the old dogmas on the subject; yet among the better portion of the Evangelical body I think there is enough of kindness and candor to elicit the acknowledgment that there is, at all events, much to be said in favor of the views which we have suggested. At least, there has been a willingness to confess that the popular belief is not quite so plainly taught in the New Testament, as it used to be taken for granted it was. And many who are unable to adopt our views fully, and who on the whole, perhaps feel compelled to abide pretty nearly where they were, yet cheerfully concede that there is so much of difficulty about it, that there is fairly room for difference of opinion among Christians. This is something. And if the present controversy shall at all aid in diminishing the notion of their necessary infallibility, which all sects, and almost all individual christians so *really assume*, while they *verbally repudiate*, there will be much to thank God for. This terrible popery which we all hug—every sect its own pope—aye, and every man, too—how fearfully destructive is it of all that we ought to cherish. I hope those christians who assail the doctrine of eternal torment will be able to do justice to their own views in that spirit of modesty which we can never be at liberty to lay aside.

Perhaps a word or two as to the way in which I was led to renounce the common belief on this matter, may not be wholly unacceptable, since I was the first minister of any evangelical body who openly avowed his dissent; at least, from all I have ever heard, I believe I was the first to put his name to any thing on this side of the controversy. I first settled as Pastor over the Baptist Church at Great Missenden, Bucks, in the year 1834, and at that time preached all the doctrines that are usually recognized as orthodox among us.

And I very well remember delivering two argumentative discourses in defence of the doctrine of the everlasting misery of the lost. I have them by me still. Subsequently, however, I began to ask myself more rigidly, why I held this, and that, and the other tenet, and so went into a long discussion with myself on several matters. Among other things I demanded of myself why I affirmed that the sinner would exist for ever in torment. The usual answers were at hand—but, scrutinizing them as an enquirer *de novo*, who required to be *satisfied* rather than put off, I found much of the ground on which I had formerly stood so confidently, give way under me.

I was in no haste. Disagreeable as is suspense—unpleasant as it is to have one's judgment in abeyance—to be obliged to say to one's self, "I dont exactly know what to believe on this point"; and however much the awkwardness is increased when the individual stands as a public teacher, and has almost daily to be expounding and enforcing the great truths of religion; yet any thing is better than tampering with one's own conscience, lessening one's sensitive loyalty to truth, and so possibly helping to maintain error, by a cowardly and unworthy impatience of suspense.

I took to preaching more thoroughly what I did believe, and often found myself dwelling with more satisfaction on the fact, that Christ came to give life to his people. My views gradually became clearer; and in proportion as the truth (as I deem it) was better discerned, the trumpet gave forth less and less of an uncertain sound. But I never assailed the popular belief so much as I, among my own people, superseding it by the presentation of the positive that I had slowly come to hold. If the truth be exhibited, the error will die. Several years have now elapsed since I first published the "Notes of Seven Lectures on Future Punishment" that I had delivered to my own congregation, and printed at their request. The question is often put to me, "Do you still adhere, after further thought, to the views you have advocated?" And my answer is often something in this strain, when I am not shut up to a categorical reply, by stress of time:

There are but three things possible, only three theories which can be held, viz:

1. *Those who die in a state of impenitence will be sooner or later converted to God in the next state, and so be saved:—or,*

2. *They will continue to exist for ever in a state of alienation, and therefore of misery:—or,*

3. *They will cease to be, perish for ever.*

I can conceive of no fourth alternative. I do not limit the Holy One, but I cannot invent another possibility. Of these predicaments, the first is the happiest, that which most commends itself to the heart, and which seems the most worthy of God, and the most honorable to him. But if we are to confine ourselves to the SCRIPTURE ARGUMENT, our own independent opinions are hushed, the moral argument is declined; and in this case, I feel as confident as a modest man may be—first, that Scripture does not proclaim a salvation hereafter for those who die impenitent here; secondly, that it still less teaches the horrible dogma that Evil shall eternally dishonor God, and appal the saved; and thirdly, that, whatever difficulties encumber the only remaining theory, (and how can even the truth be without its obscurities in this present twilight?) the New Testament does seem throughout to teach that immortality is the gift of God, through Christ, to those who believe, and all who are not rendered meet for an inheritance among the Saints in light, will cease to be.

It may appear almost strange to some, if I add, that, after having spent several years in the anxious investigation of this subject, as soon as I had discharged my conscience of the duty of giving the results of my thoughts to the world, I sought to recover my mental elasticity and independence by disencumbering my mind of the whole question, turning my attention to other matters of importance, and ceasing to take any *special* interest in this one department of enquiry. This I did, lest I should become too one-sided, and see all things through one medium, having perceived how common a thing it is to err in this way. And a second object I had in view was, that, by thus calling off the mind from any undue attention to one point, I might be the better qualified at some future period, if spared, to review once more the whole question, not as a partizan, or advocate, but as an impartial inquirer. I resolved, therefore, not to reply to any attack that might be made on me, and as it was not likely that another edition would be called for, I considered myself to have finished this part of my work; at least for a long time. Indeed, I could not afford to keep up the war. The sale of my last work—the Edition of 1846—has not paid the expenses. I am still out of pocket by the endeavor to correct the presumed errors of the evangelical church, and must leave to men who have a better purse the honor of following up the effort. It affords me very considerable pleasure, however, to find how earnestly you and your coadjutors are working the question in the New World. May God crown all your endeavors with his most abundant blessing. Accept my heartiest thanks for your kindness in sending me the two numbers of the "Examiner." If the posting of them cost you nothing, I need hardly say that I should feel gratified by your continuing to forward me any

number that contains snything on the subject. Believe me, my dear sir, yours faithfully,

H. H. Dobney.

---

## "Mysterious Rappings."

[Continued from page 10.]

At length these manifestations commenced at Mr. Sunderland's house, Charlestown, Mass., adjoining Boston. He thus speaks of it:

"I had frequently had *manifestations*, when alone, since last June, but no audible *answers* to questions, till each member of my family happened to be present. Then, asking my children to respond, the oldest one did so, *audibly*, for an hour or so, upon the *cradle*, around which the family circle was formed! As if the precious spirit of our child, having left the cradle for the grave, would come back and announce his presence by a rap, as upon the very place where his fond parents last gazed upon his infantile features, when smitten by the hand of death! The consolation thus afforded us may be imagined; described it cannot be."

We should be truly sorry to deprive him of such "*consolation*," if we did not believe fidelity to him, to truth, and to God demanded it of us. It is true we have little hope of arresting *him* in his present course; but we do not despair of saving some from, what we regard, a most fatal deception. In speaking further on the subject of these spirits entering his house, Mr. Sunderland says:

"With other favored names which have appeared in our columns as *mediums*, we are now permitted to place that of our first-born and beloved daughter, Mrs. Margaretta Cooper. My friends in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, and Louisville, Ky., will not need to be told who she is, nor reminded of the music she made for her father's audiences in those places in 1848, coming, as we used to say, from the '*spirit world!*' The responses we have had through her have been most convincing and satisfactory indeed. How gratifying, how pleasant, how heavenly, to find our own family thus taken possession of, as it were, by the Heavenly Hosts! O, how insignificant is all earthly good, when compared to this privilege! At our table, during meal time, by day and night, thus to be permitted to hold open communion with the Spirit World!"

Thus Mr. Sunderland is highly delighted to entertain these visitors, and is so wrapped up in the enjoyment of their society, that our readers must not be astonished to hear him pray to them, and acknowledge them as Paul acknowledged the God of heaven, as the following address to them will show. It is found in the Philosopher, page 69, and is Mr. S.'s dedication:

"To my Friends in Heaven: Harmonious Spirits! Now I cease from the external. Now I become conscious of your presence. So peaceful. So pleasant. Come, come to me, the good and the true. My nature expands to receive you. Welcome, thrice welcome, here! I long for your presence. Delight in your society. Become tranquil when you are near. Exult in your love, in which I live, move, and have my being. Now I understand. Your light makes manifest. Now I aspire for goodness and truth. Now, to have consciousness of my own true destiny. O, blissful thought. This indeed is Heaven. What though I yet animate an external Form! Am I not what you are? Have I not eyes which see without the sun's light? Ears that hear without earthly sound? Senses, which cannot be satisfied without you? No more animal life without *air*, than spiritual life without a Spirit World. Becoming one with you, one in essence, one in destiny, I no longer live without you. No more do I lean on a reed that is broken. No more wander in darkness. No more feed on that which cannot satisfy. To be disappointed no more. Yes, well do I know you. In your external form I knew you. We took sweet counsel together. When you threw aside the outward covering, I was with you. Then you *left* me? No: you, yourself, did not leave me. The magnet leaves not the pole by which it is attracted. Precious friends of my soul! In the depths of my innermost life I bless you. Struggling with the external, the fleeting, my spirit follows hard after you! Yes, you know what I am, and what I would be. An evenly-balanced, well-governed, intelligent mind. Comprehended in Harmony, which, indeed, is Contentment, Gratitude and Hope, for ever."

If the foregoing is not a set and solemn act of worship, we beg to know what would be? Yes, a set and deliberate act of consecration to these spirits, such only as can, with innocence, be made to the Most High God himself. In the light of prayer and consecration Mr. S. evidently regarded it; for, at the close, in brackets, he says:—

"The above was written Sabbath, September the 8th, 1850, between three and four o'clock, P. M., in my study, Charlestown, Mass. In less than six hours after writing it, I had *audible* responses made to me, in the presence of my family, from the Spirit World."

This was truly a speedy answer to his prayer and dedication of himself to these *new gods*. That he regards them as his gods appears clear from the following language, on the same page:

"Had I ten thousand tongues, it seems as if I could use them all in blessing the *Angelic Hosts*, who have thus taken possession of my earthly sphere! I now enjoy a Heaven far more *real* than any I had ever been taught to anticipate by the old and discordant Theology, out of which I am now conscious of being so completely redeemed."

Here are sentiments that need no comment. Mr. Sunderland worships "*Angelic Hosts*"—by which, of course, he means the spirits of dead men, women, and babies: they are his gods, as truly as the "*Calf* of Samaria" was the god of Israel in the days of Jeroboham and the other idolatrous kings. And he is "redeemed" by these gods, "completely," from "the old Theology." If he had said *partially* "redeemed" we might not have disputed his assertion; for it is manifest, "the old Theology" that man has an "immortal soul," that does not die with the body, but survives it, is the very life of this *angel worship*. Yes, this new developement from the "Spirit World" is all the fruit of immortal soulism.

The grand mission of these spirits is "to convince men that they have immortal souls." If the Bible taught that doctrine, their mission would be superfluous: but it does not, and therefore these spirits come to sustain a crumbling theory; and that very theory is the life blood of this delusion. Satan ventures not out in his own character: he would sooner hide in a "serpent" than show his real colors. He therefore takes advantage of the popular belief of immortal-soulism, and the spirit surviving after death, and comes to the adherents of that doctrine with the disguised name of a *dear wife, husband, brother, sister,* or *child;* and tells the surviving relatives how much he *loves* them; and how very concerned he is for their happiness! O, how cruel it must be to charge these loving spirits with being *impostors—lying spirits!* To tell them plainly—they are not of God, but are of the devil, and his works they do. How hard it must be to impeach their good will! How fearful to say to them—"Get behind me Satan"! How cruel to the immortal spirits of our *dear little babies* to treat them so!

We have said that this new method of gaining "light" asserts, that all men gain by death. Mr. Sunderland, in the Philosopher, page 71, says:

"We have often heard Spirits asked if they were happy, and, with one exception, the answer has been in the affirmative; but even that one Spirit said he was better off in that world than he had been in this. So that we may say that all the manifestations seem to favor the idea, that the next sphere is a better state for all."

This new method of getting "light" is direct in its tendency to usher in the cry of "Peace and Safety," in a manner more perfect than it has ever been made by any previous theory. Such a cry we know, from the testimony of Scripture, is to be made just prior to the second advent of Jesus Christ, to *destroy* the "Man of Sin," and to vindicate the truth of God from all the aspersions cast upon it by lying "spirits," to whatever "sphere" they belong.

We now give a specimen of what the Spiritual Philosopher calls "*Gems from the Spirit World.*" It is as follows:

"How often have I been elevated and delighted with the *ideas* which have been communicated to me, or attendant friends, when holding *audience* with the Spirit World! Sometimes they come from a husband or a wife,—a parent or child, and always so *appropriate*, so expressive, and satisfactory! And where shall we look for *pearls* and *diamonds*, if not to the Spirit Sphere? Where for beautiful flowers of the most agreeable fragrance, but in the Spirit Land? Where for music, if not from the source of *Harmony* and *Love*? 'Mother, dear,' says the spirit of the little one, 'I am always near to you!' Says a mother in the Spirit World to her child,—'Dear Emma, I love you!' Another says, 'Ellen, dear! my child, I love you. Be good. I am with you always, and will keep you from harm!' Said a Guardian Spirit to me, 'I love you, and will assist you always.' I asked 'Roy' (my first son, now fifteen years in the spirit world) what *idea* he could first remember? He spelled out, in answer, the word—'*Happiness!*' Blessed thought! An existence begun in a happy sphere, or developed into *consciousness* of happiness in that sphere, must be happy, and this too, without any mixture of pain. I asked the spirit of my son if he knew what *fear* or pain was, and he answered that he did not."

Several things may be noted in the foregoing extract. First, there is an evident abandonment of the Bible as a source of comfort and instruction. The first part of the extract shows this clearly, though the Bible is not named. Second,—there is a manifest turning away from the Spirit of God—the true "*Comforter*"—to seek comfort in the spirits of dead men, women, and children. Third,—the deceptive character of the spirits may be clearly seen: they are "*familiar* spirits;" the spirits of loved ones; thus throwing the living entirely off their guard, and removing all suspicion of deception. Thus they are to make themselves essential to the happiness of those they address, and lead them away from all reliance on the Bible, or the God of the Bible; and so Jesus Christ, the *one* Mediator, is to be "crucified afresh," and in due time denounced as an impostor! Let our readers mark well what we have here said; and beware that "the very elect" are not deceived by this "old serpent," dressed up in the garb of "an angel of light," to make his last demonstration, to deceive the unwary, just prior to his going into "perdition."

These spirits, and their advocates, have an instinctive horror at the idea that any one should believe that there is such a spirit as "SATAN" or the "DEVIL!" No wonder they have. For, once admit it as a *fact* that there is such an existence as the devil, or satan,—*evil spirits*—and the mask is off—community would be more on their guard; though not then safe so long as they believe, *also,* that there are spirits of dead men equally conscious as Satan himself. In other words,—no man is safe from these deceptive spirits who believes the soul is naturally immortal and survives the dissolution of the body, in a conscious state. How can such a believer prove that these spirits, now making these manifestations, are not what they profess to be? *viz.*, the spirits of their deceased friends? But, once settle the point that there is no immortality out of Christ, and no future life except by a resurrection, or translation, and these spirits are *demonstrated* to be "lying spirits;" because, they all claim to be the spirits of men, women, and children who have lived in the flesh. Hence their great anxiety to prove "*the soul is immortal;*" for this they profess, is their grand mission. No wonder, we repeat it, they are so concerned to establish that

point; for upon it turns all their success in this last desperate effort to deceive the world, and prepare men for the personal advent of Satan *as* an "*angel of Light*," but truly as *the* "Man of Sin, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped;" and who is the immediate forerunner of the Lord's advent from heaven the second time. This topic we shall dwell upon fully before we close what we have to say on this matter.

Mr. Sunderland, in the Philosopher, page 74, in addressing what he calls his "spiritual children," by which he means those who have come under his influence when he was practicing "Pathetism," says:

"I have often said to myself and intimate friends, within the last six months, 'O, this communion with spirits is a better heaven here, than the old theology I once believed and taught promised me, even in the world to come.' With those, therefore, who have been intromitted to the spirit world, it may be truly said, 'old things are passed away,' and many things, if not all, have become new. Indeed, no stories of elysium, nor of the christian millenium, ever equalled the realities which are now daily brought to the test of our external senses. The blind are made to see, the lame to walk, the deaf to hear, the sick are healed, and to the poor, the gospel is preached."

On the foregoing extract, we remark, first—Mr. Sunderland has evidently exchanged "communion" with God the Father, and His Son Jesus Christ, which he once professed to enjoy, for "communion with spirits," of which he knows nothing except on their own testimony. Second—In this new "communion" he has found "a better heaven here" than he "once believed and taught * * in the world to come." Third,—"Those who have been intromitted"—that is, *introduced*, or, have admission—"to the spirit world" have "truly" undergone a change which he compares with the apostle's statement concerning those who are "*in Christ*." In other words, to be inducted into communion with these spirits is *equal*, if not superior, to what the christian calls, being *in Christ*.

Fourth,—"No stories of the *Christian* millennium, ever equalled the realities" which he "now daily" has "brought to" his "external senses." Thus the personal reign of Christ in his glory, with his saints made immortal—the earth restored to its Eden state—sin and the curse removed, have all faded away before this "*light*," for which Mr. S. so ardently prayed, and said, "no matter how it comes." A fearful prayer! and a fearful answer it has been! But he does not stop here.

Fifth,—Nearly all the miracles Christ wrought in confirmation of the gospel of the kingdom of God, are claimed as being wrought by himself through Pathetism, in which he now says, he has been aided by these spirits. At this point Mr. S. approaches a little nearer to blaspheming *Christ* than at any other. He quotes the words of Jesus, though without giving *credit*, and applies them to the wonders himself has performed in cures by "Pathetism."

Sixth,—"To the poor, the gospel is preached," says Mr. S. But what gospel it is his words show us. It is the "gospel" of "communion with spirits," which, he says, is "*better*" than that which proclaims "the christian millennium!!" Now, the proclamation of "the christian millennium" is identical with preaching "the kingdom of God." Preaching the kingdom of God was the work of Jesus Christ and his apostles. Mr. S. has "*another gospel*"—a "*better*" one, he says; but an apostle has said—"Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach *any other gospel* unto you than that we have preached, *let him be accursed*." These spirits now making manifestations, which so delight Mr. S., and others, do "preach another gospel," which their devotees say, is "better" than that preached by Christ and his apostles. Against this *blasphemous assumption* we raise our warning voice: and let all who value Eternal Life beware of all intercourse with these lying spirits, who are now abroad doing their last work of deception. Let none deceive themselves by the supposition that there is *no reality* in these manifestations. We believe they are real. On that point we have no controversy with the advocates of this new development: we admit the facts they affirm; but we deny the the *character* the spirits claim, and that their worshippers contend for. In our mind there is not a doubt they are the embryotic development, or forerunners of the advent of the *real* ANTICHRIST—the "Man of Sin." Whoever, therefore, shuts his eyes to the fact, that there is a *real* "communion with spirits" now going on, and to become general, may find "that day" has "come upon" him "as a snare," and he may *not* "be able to escape." We live in a fearful period for those who have had the gospel of Christ and do not heed it. Those who have not received and obeyed it, or who do not "*watch*," as Christ commanded, are to be taken in a "strong delusion," and "*believe a lie*, because they received not the love of the truth" of Christ's coming and kingdom. This last deceiving power will be "after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders."

Let us beware, then, that we are not carried away with it on the one hand, nor on the other be so indifferent to it as to be lulled into a worldly security, and thus be as fatally ruined. For those whom Satan cannot rouse to *active* service in his last great work of deception, he will strive to lull to *sleep* now: and the words of our soon coming Lord Jesus Christ are to lay on our minds with

power—"*What I say unto you, I say unto all,* WATCH."

[To be Continued.]

"ELECTION."—In our article in reply to Brother Grew, on Acts 13: 48, in the November Examiner, we made a mistake in our reference to a word in chap. 20: 13, which we detected before that number was sent off to its destination, but too late to correct it. It consists in quoting the word "*minding,*" instead of "*appointed,*" in the text—"We went before to ship, and sailed to Assos, there intending to take in Paul; for so he had *appointed—outo gar en diatetagmenos*—for so he was *disposed.*" Such is the true import of the original word. Of this fact Lowman and Whitby give many examples in their comments on Acts 13: 48, and themselves translate the term—*tetagmenoi*—"*disposed for.*" "As many as were *disposed for* eternal life believed."

In the Hebrew of the O. T. there are *eleven* words, which are translated *ordain*, ordaineth, and ordained. One of those words, *viz.: Orakh*—has this definition—"*to arrange, to prepare.*" This word occurs first in Psa. 132: 17. "I have *ordained*"—*prepared, arranged*—"a lamp for mine anointed." The next place of its occurrence, is Isa. 38: 33:—"Tophet is *ordained*"—*prepared*—"of old." Our authority is, "*The Bible Students' Concordance;* by Aaron Pick, Professor of Hebrew and Chaldea, from the University of Prague." In this work, Prof. Pick gives us all the Hebrew words of the Old Testament, and their "*literal* meaning." It is a work of great value to the "English Reader," for whose benefit it is designed.

It will be seen by the quotation we have given above, that our English word "*ordained,*" has the sense in Hebrew of "*prepared,*" or "arranged." Claiming the benefit of this meaning of the word, we bring it forward to help in the explanation of Acts, 13: 48—"As many as were *ordained* to eternal life, believed." Clearly, to our mind, the sense is—"As many as were *prepared* for eternal life, believed." That is—As many as had given careful and *candid* attention to the truth, the Apostles had spoken, in their previous discourses, now "believed" the doctrine about "eternal life," which they had heard; for, "*faith cometh by hearing.*" "The Jews" had heard in part, but their "*envy*" at the attention which the "multitudes" gave to the preaching of "Paul and Barnabas," unfitted them to hear to profit; so they "*contradicted and blasphemed;*" and, hence, were not "*ordained*"—*were not prepared* by the ministry of the Apostles to receive and believe the glorious truth of "eternal life," by and through Jesus Christ. Others were ordained, or *prepared*, or "disposed," by the teaching of the Apostles, and hence believed.

That such is the true sense of this text, we have no doubt. To refer the language to a decree, or irresistible purpose of God, that those *individuals* should have eternal life, and to assign that as *the reason* why they "believed," it seems to us, is, however undesigned, to represent God as mocking his creatures, when he says—"As I live, I have no pleasure in the *death* of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and *live;*" and adds, "*Why will ye die?*" Now, if their "eternal life" depends upon His "ordaining" them to it, in the sense of an absolute *decree;* and if without such ordination they never will believe, which ordination He refuses to exercise in relation to all who die, then, most manifestly, there is an apparent want of sincerity on the part of God, when he solemnly affirms He has "no pleasnre in the death of the wicked." It will not meet the case at all to say—"He has no pleasure in their death in *itself considered.*" He makes no such *reservation* in His oath in the matter; and it is not fitting that we mortals should make it for Him, and thereby, virtually, charge Him with duplicity, or double dealing.

We say, once more,—No man is *ordained* to eternal life, in the sense of being set apart for it, *by God's act*, till he has passed through his trial in this life. "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give you a crown of life," saith the "Faithful and True Witness." Till then, even Paul found it necessary to keep his body under, and bring it into subjection; "lest that by any means" * * he "*should be a cast away.*" See 1 Cor. 9: 27. Such language is totally, and eternally irreconcilable with the notion that he believed himself, at that time, set apart of God to eternal life, that is, eternally *ordained* to it.

The act of ordination, Acts 13: 48, is not to be referred to some unknown and eternal act of God; the context forbids it. The minds of those who "believed" had been "*prepared*" by the words to which they had candidly listened, and being thus *prepared* they believed. Not one word is said of any decree of God in the matter; it is a simple *contrast* between candid and uncandid hearers. The latter were not *prepared*, the former were, and THEREFORE *believed.*

Since writing the foregoing we have examined Dr. Adam Clark's comments on this text, which we had not read before for years. He says:—

"Whatever *tetagmenoi* may mean, which is the word translated, *ordained*, it is neither *protetagmenoi*, nor *proorismenoi*, which the Apostle uses, but simply *tetagmenoi*, which includes no idea of *preordination* or *predestination* of *any kind.*" He enquires,—"What does the word *tetagmenoi* mean?" and answers—"The verb *tatto*, or *tasso*, signifies to *place, set, order, appoint, dispose*, hence it has been considered here as implying the *disposition* or *readiness of mind* of several persons in the congregation,

such as the *religious proselytes* mentioned in verse 43, who possessed the reverse of the disposition of those Jews, who *spake against those things, contradicting and blaspheming*, ver. 44." He adds—"Those who seek for the plain meaning of the word, will find it here; those who wish to make out a sense, not from the Greek word, its use among the best Greek writers, and the obvious sense of the Evangelist, but from their own creed, may continue to puzzle themselves and others, * * having bidden adieu to the true meaning of a passage so very simple, taken in its connexion, that one wonders how it ever came to be misunderstood and misapplied."

We now leave the subject of "Election," repeating what we said in November, viz.:—"The subject was ably discussed in the last century, by Fletcher, Toplady, and others; and nothing new, scarcely, can be said on the subject." We wish not, therefore, to protract the discussion in our colums; and we should have let our mistake pass, but that a brother said—"for the truths' sake publish the following correction of the criticism on Acts 13: 48 and 20: 13." His "correction" we have not published. The "correction" is *our own;* and the mistake was seen by us, probably, before he saw the paper containing it; but to save words we might have let it pass without correction; as we then believed, and still believe, we gave the *true sense* of Acts 13: 48.

## THE TRUE SOURCE OF IMMORTALITY.

By Thomas Read, New York.

(Continued from page 5.)

IMMORTALITY IS THE PURCHASE OF THE DEATH OF CHRIST.

Having fully shown that all mankind have inherited from Adam a perishing nature, and are all alike subjected to the curse of death as the penalty of transgression, "by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope," for the wages of sin is death, and that the fiat of Jehovah of "Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return," "passes upon all men for that all have sinned;" and but for the mercy of God in Christ Jesus, and the introduction of a remedial system, they would all have eternally perished: we now proceed to show that the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord. And that this life is imparted to us by Christ having redeemed us from the curse of the law, which is death; that is, he hath bought us back again from death, through the promise of a future resurrection to life, by becoming a curse for us; the chastisement of our peace being upon him; that his soul was made an offering for sin; that Satan bruised his heel, by making it necessary for Christ to become subject to death, and Christ having finished the work of redemption, by paying the ransom price, the penalty of the law, which was death, the entire cessation of life and consciousness, Christ was raised again from the dead by the Eternal Spirit, "because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth;" therefore, the justice of God made it impossible that he should be holden by death, and he ascended into the heavens, "where he ever liveth to make intercession for us;" and God hath begotten us again to a *hope of life*, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, RESERVED IN HEAVEN FOR YOU,... ready to be revealed in the last time. See 1 Pet. 1.

Thus hath Christ despoiled Satan of his victory over the righteous; who, having been tried by the malice of Satan, are better disciplined, and better qualified for the enjoyment of everlasting life. While those only have been finally subdued by Satan, who have proved, as well as counted themselves unworthy of everlasting life. And God having overruled the malice of Satan to subserve his own purposes, in the development of human character; at his second coming, will wrest the righteous from the dominion of death, and bruise the serpent's head, by destroying both him and his works. O grave, where is thy victory? And as in Adam all die, (through the temptations of Satan,) so in Christ SHALL all be made alive, by a resurrection from the dead. Thus is Christ made the Saviour of all men, redeeming all from death, and especially of those who believe, who will die no more. While those who *will not* come unto Christ that they *might have life*, do indeed rise again from the dead, but only to the resurrection of condemnation to the second death.

All this "is now made manifest by the (first) *appearing* of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life. "Who gave himself a ransom for all." This immortality is the gift of God, who hath given his Son, and is dispensed by Christ, through the sacrifice of himself. The gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Now, obviously, if immortality be the gift of God, dependant upon God's giving his Son, and Christ giving himself, it must be *contingent*, and if contingent it is NOT inherent, for God might have withheld his Son, or the Son might have withheld the sacrifice of himself, and then the whole race of mankind would have eternally perished in their own corruption. We are now fully prepared for the second question.

*Is immortality* CONTINGENT, *a* GIFT *which God, through Jesus Christ, bestows upon man subsequently to his birth, and* NOT TO BE FULLY REALIZED TILL THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD?

This we affirm; and that immortality is the gift of God, dispensed by Jesus Christ, is moreover further proved by the following scriptures.

1 John 5: 11.—And this is the record, that God hath *given* to us *eternal life:* and this *life* IS IN HIS SON. He that hath the SON, HATH LIFE; and he that hath not the Son of God, *hath not life.*

John 6: 32.—My Father giveth you the true bread from heaven, for the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth LIFE unto the world.

John 10: 27.—My sheep hear my voice . . . . . and *I give* unto them *eternal life;* and they shall never *perish.*

John 17: 2.—Thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him.

*Immortality is conditional, conferred by promise, to be sought for, and to be chosen, the great object of the Christian's hope, and the crown of his rejoicing.*

It would be folly to seek for, and hope for, what we already possess, and to choose that which is not an object of choice.

Rom. 8: 24.—For we are saved by *hope*: but hope that is seen is not hope: for what a man seeth, *why doth he yet hope for?* But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience WAIT for it. That is, we wait "to be delivered from the bondage of corruption," in which we shall be held by the dominion of the grave, "into the glorious liberty of the children of God." Even we, who "have the first fruits of the Spirit," and are already the children of God, by promise, WAIT "for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body."—Rom. 8: 23.

Thus then the object of our hope, the adoption, and the redemption to eternal life, are things future

Rom. 2: 7.—To them who by patient continuance in well doing, SEEK FOR glory, and honor, and immortality; God, the righteous judge WILL render "*eternal life.*"

1 Tim. 6: 12.—*Lay hold on eternal life.*

Deut. 30: 19.—I have set before thee *life* and *death*, blessing and cursing: therefore CHOOSE life, that both thou and thy seed may live.

James 1: 12.—Blessed is the man that endureth temptation: for when he is tried, he shall receive the crown of life, which the Lord hath promised to them that love him. See Tit. 3: 7.

Rev. 2: 7.—To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the Paradise of God. 2: 10.—Be thou faithful unto death and I will give you the crown of life.

John 6: 39.—"This is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day." Clearly implying if they were not raised up, they would be lost.

And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day. Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life: and I will raise him up at the last day. John 6: 53.

Labor for the meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give unto you. John 6: 27.

Mark 10: 17.—What shall I *do*, that I may inherit eternal life?

Matt. 19: 17.—If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.

Rev. 22: 14.—Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have a right to the tree of life.

Suppose an opponent should venture to contradict the plain testimony of the Spirit of truth, and affirm that it is eternal happiness and not eternal life that is to be sought for; let him read the last verse according to the third rule, page 172, Vol. v. Happy are they that do his commandments, that they may have a right to be happy. No, no, those who are qualified for immortality will necessarily be happy, when God's will is done in the new heavens and the new earth, for in the presence of the King, is fulness of joy.

In all the preceding scriptures, immortality is made a matter of promise, is said to be given conditionally on gospel terms; and is to be sought for, labored for, chosen, and so forth; all which exhortations are utterly irreconcilable with the ideas of natural immortality, but are irresistibly conclusive, that Jesus Christ is the great dispenser of immortality, by a resurrection of the dead, through the mediatorial system. As infants have been redeemed from death, those who have not personally sinned, will not be condemned at the resurrection of the dead.

In numerous passages, particularly in John 6: 39 40, 53; Luke 18: 30, Jesus Christ connects future life with the resurrection of the dead, in such a manner, as to affirm, that if his people were not raised up at the last day, they would be lost. And in his exposition of Moses, he taught that the dead are raised, by calling God the God of the living. Matt. 22: 31. Now, if the soul could have knowledge apart from the body, God would be the God of Abraham, who is dead, without a resurrection, and consequently a God of the dead, a plain contradiction of the obvious import of Christ's words.

Col. 3: 3.—For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When CHRIST, who is our life, shall appear, THEN shall ye also *appear* with him in glory.

Paul affirms positively that "If the dead rise not . . . . . then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ ARE PERISHED. 1 Cor. 15: 16, 18.

Will an objector take upon himself the responsibility to contradict, and say—No, Paul, the souls of the righteous are conscious and happy without a resurrection? Alas! there is a deal of unbelief where it is but little suspected! If the soul could be happy after death, without a resurrection, how could Paul say—"If in this life only, we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable"? 1 Cor. 15: 19. And again—"If after the manner of men, I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the dead rise not? let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die: v. 32.

Here Paul reiterates that, without a resurrection, there is no future existence, and if the dead rise not, it is wisdom to make the most of the present world, for it is all our portion. It is utterly impossible to to reconcile this strong assertion with truth, if Paul believed that there is an intermediate state of conscious happiness, between death and the resurrection.

If death confers upon the soul increased powers, increased knowledge, and increased happiness; what advantage had Enoch and Elijah, who are represented as being especially privileged, the one in being translated, that he should *not see* death, and the other in going bodily to heaven, in a whirlwind and a chariot of fire? Our modern philosophers, making void the word of God, would have said, it is better that the "immortal souls" of these saints should have gone alone and disembodied to heaven and bliss, rather than to be encumbered with material bodies. But God thought otherwise, and his word declares that death is a penalty, a curse, a punishment, and that it is not the conductor of the soul to glory; which can only be effected by a resurrection from the dead, by him who is emphatically the "RESURRECTION and the LIFE."

We are told of only two worlds, the present and the world to come; and in contrasting the afflictions of the one, with the *eternal* weight of glory

of the other, Paul says, "We look not at the things which are seen. but at the things that are not seen: for the things that are seen are *temporal;* but the things that are not seen are ETERNAL." 2 Cor. 4: 18.

Those who affirm that there is an unseen spirit-world of disembodied souls, conscious and happy, to be consistent with this declaration of Paul, must affirm that it is ETERNAL; and consequently, that there is no resurrection, and that Christ will not "set upon the throne of his father David." Into such inconsistencies does a departure from the plain declarations of the scriptures lead us. And comparing his bodies to houses; that is, his present body and his resurrection body, Paul argues of the one, that it is earthly, and shall be dissolved, that the knowledge of the glory of God is given us in earthen vessels, and "knowing that He which raised up the Lord Jesus, shall raise up us also, by Jesus, and shall present us with you . . . . . for we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things IN BODY;" therefore he earnestly desires to be clothed upon with his eternal house, that mortality might be swallowed up in life. And as God had already given him the earnest of the Spirit, he was willing rather to lay aside his earthly body, not that he might put it off merely, be unclothed: but that he might put on the other, the heavenly body. He was willing to "hide" himself, as it were, "for a little moment," and his life being hid with Christ in God, he knew that when Christ, his life, should appear, that he also should appear with him in glory. And though he had the sentence of death within himself, yet he "trusted in God, *which raiseth the dead,*" for he knew he should rejoice with his Corinthian converts "*in* the day of the Lord Jesus," and *then* he should be ever with the Lord. His reasoning here and elsewhere, entirely excludes the possibility of an intermediate state of consciousness.

(To be Continued.)

---

"DOBNEY ABRIDGED."—We have just published the "*Second Part*" of "The Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment, by H. H. Dobney," Baptist Minister, England, in an edition by itself. Our object has been to furnish all that is really essential in the controversy, to enable the reader to decide whether *endless torture,* or *destruction of being,* is the true teaching of Scripture in relation to the end of the wicked: and to furnish it so *cheap* as to place it within the reach of all. The "*First Part*" of the work, though exceedingly valuable as a theological exposition of the moral government of God, does not go into the argument of the *final* end of the wicked; and contains very little but what nearly all professed Christians would assent to. The Second Part is *the* great "*Argument*" which casts down the Moloch of Christendom and grinds it to powder. Any intelligent mind, we think, will be satisfied of this who may read David N. Lord's Review, in the "Theological Journal" for January. If Mr. Lord cannot make the Moloch of Endless Torments stand on its legs, who can? But he has utterly failed in his late Review, so we judge. He has left the main argument entirely untouched and unharmed. The general truth stands all the stronger for this effort to raise *dust* to hide the glorious *Scripture Towers* Mr. Dobney has developed.

The "*abridged*" work we put up in *paper covers,* and at the extremely low price of *twenty-five cents* single copy, of about 220 pages, 12 mo. *Six* copies may be had for *one dollar,* current money, sent to us free of expense.

Let this work be scattered like leaves over the land. The truth it contains will not return void: and now is the time to send it forth, while Mr. Lord's Review is fresh in mind, and has called attention to the work.

None of the "*abridged*" work will be bound: all in paper covers, neatly executed.

All orders and remittances must be directed,

GEO. STORRS, Philadelphia, Pa.

---

DOBNEY UNABRIDGED.—*Price Reduced.*—We have determined to put this work, on "Future Punishment," hereafter, at *fifty cents,* bound in muslin. The future editions will be published in Philadelphia, instead of New York.

---

## BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

We design to keep constantly on hand the following works on the grand gospel truth of "*Immortality for man only in Christ,*" and let a new effort be made to place them in every house in the land.

1. SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT, by *H. H. Dobney,* Baptist Minister, England; 286 pages, 12mo. It is a most luminous defence of the truth that *immortality* is to be possessed *only* by a union with Christ. *Price* 50 cents, bound; or 37½ in paper covers, suitable to be sent by mail.

2. DIALOGUES ON FUTURE PUNISHMENT, by *Rev. Wm. Glen Moncrieff,* Scotland. A most valuable and convincing work, which ought to be in the hands of every person where the gospel is preached. It is a pamphlet of 60 pages, 12mo. *Price,* 15 cents.

3. THE UNITY OF MAN, OR LIFE AND DEATH REALITIES. A REPLY TO REV. LUTHER LEE, by *Anthropos.* This is a thorough refutation of Mr. Lee's position of the natural immortality of man's fancied "immortal soul." It contains 122 pages, 18mo., in paper covers. *Price* 15 cents.

4. SIX SERMONS, by *Geo. Storrs*: An inquiry, *Are the wicked Immortal?* to which is *added,* a dissertation on the State of the Dead; and *prefixed* Archbishop Whately's remarks on *The Second Death!* Thousands of copies have been scattered abroad. The work will speak for itself. It has 128 pages, 18mo., in paper covers. *Price 15 cents.*

5. STORRS' MISCELLANY.—This contains the Six Sermons—Unity of Man—Rich man and Lazarus—Second Death, by Whately—Can you believe? by Moncrieff—The Two Thrones, by Geo. Storrs, and the inquiry, Have the Dead Knowledge? bound in *one volume,* making 275 pages. Price 42 cents.

6. THE IMMATERIALITY OF THE SOUL, by *Thomas Read,* New York.—This is a Pamphlet of 24 pages, 12mo., in covers. A most complete exposure of the unphilosophical and unscriptural notion that the soul is Immaterial. *Price,* 7 cents single; or $4 per hundred.

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VI. PHILADELPHIA, MARCH, 1851. No. 3.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,

AT 198 MARSHALL STREET, THIRD DOOR ABOVE BROWN,

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, one dollar; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; ALWAYS IN ADVANCE.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.


## THE TRUE SOURCE OF IMMORTALITY.

BY THOMAS READ, NEW YORK.

(Continued from page 30.)

We now enter more fully upon the arguments deduced from the Resurrection, showing that IF THERE WERE NO RESURRECTION, THERE WOULD BE NO FUTURE LIFE.

That the second coming of Christ to raise the dead, was the hope of the primitive christians; was waited for, and longed for with intense solicitude; was the period when the saints expected first to see Christ in person, and to be rewarded; and the considerations by which the apostolic injunctions to duty were enforced, is sufficiently obvious.

### UPON THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY.

That the body will be raised again is a glorious truth; but as the phrase "the Resurrection of the Body," cannot be found in the scriptures, and has only been made necessary by the belief of the common theory, we pass on by simply condemning the use of the phrase.

We proceed now to discuss, so far as relates to the questions at issue, what in scripture is emphatically called—

### "THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD."

In accordance with the too common belief, the Resurrection sinks into a small matter. For if all the saints entered into their happiness at death, what matters it whether in the body or out of the body? And if our souls are so much higher in the grade of being than our bodily organization, why clog our spiritual natures, with the grosser material form, impeding their motions, and diminishing their powers? And which will not, according to the prevalent belief, add to their glory or their happiness. If the common theory were true, it would not be a resurrection of the dead at all; but a reunion of the living soul; containing all the essential characteristics of the man; his moral powers, his knowledge, his emotions; which have never died! with the re-made body. Reunion would seem to be the more appropriate name. For if man's higher nature never died; man, the whole man, could not be raised again from the dead. Who has not heard the phrase—"the soul and body shall be reunited," used instead of the scriptural phrase, that "the dead shall rise again"? But if immortality be only in Christ Jesus: and if Jesus Christ is the Resurrection and the Life; then is the Resurrection of the Dead the most important doctrine of the Bible, and it assumes that pre-eminence that Jesus Christ and Paul ascribe to it when they make our whole future existence to depend upon it. Without it, the very purpose for which God made the world, and introduced the mediatorial system, to purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works, and to establish an everlasting kingdom wherein dwelleth righteousness, where Christ should sit upon the throne of his father David, would be entirely frustrated; Christ would have died in vain; the devil would have triumphed; and Death would have gotten a complete victory; establishing a universal and everlasting dominion over the sons of men. But it is not so; Christ has burst the bars of death, risen triumphantly into heaven, and in Christ shall all be made alive, when Christ comes to raise the dead, and judge the world, and to assign to each individual his everlasting portion. Thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory over death, through our Lord Jesus Christ. Death is swallowed up in victory.

This is Paul's opinion, for making the resurrection of Christ a pledge of our resurrection, he says: 1 Cor. 15: 16, 18—"If the dead rise not . . . . . then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ ARE PERISHED." Their faith was vain, the penalty of sin, which is death, the entire cessation of life and consciousness, has consigned them to everlasting nothingness; they are irretrievably perished. Again he says, "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable. Of what advantage are my sufferings and conflicts . . if the dead rise not? let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die."—v. 23.

Therefore . . . . because there is a resurrection of the dead . . . . be ye steadfast . . . forasmuch as ye know your labor is not in vain in the Lord.—v. 58.

Now, if we believe that Paul was inspired when he wrote this, then is there no intermediate state of consciousness, and the soul *is not naturally immortal.* There is no possibility of evading these conclusions, but by denying the inspiration of the scriptures. Again Paul says—

Rom. 8: 23.—"Waiting for the adoption, to wit, *the redemption of our body* . . . . when we shall be delivered from the *bondage of corruption*, into the glorious liberty of the children of God." Paul was already a child of God, by faith, but he had to submit to the bondage of corruption in the grave, not his body merely, but himself, therefore he waited for a fuller manifestation of the Sons of God, and the glory that shall there be revealed. When? At the redemption of his body, when Christ should

quicken, or enliven his mortal body; that is, at the resurrection of the dead.

THE SAINTS DID NOT EXPECT THEIR REWARD TILL THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD.

Rev. 11: 15, 18.—The seventh angel sounded, and there were great voices in heaven, saying, *The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever* . . . . And the nations were angry, *and thy wrath is come*, and the time of the dead, that they should be *judged*, and that thou should give REWARD unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great.

1 Pet. 1: 3, 4, 13.—Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which, according to his abundant mercy, hath begotten us again unto a lively hope, (or hope of life) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, *reserved in heaven* for you, . . . . *ready to be revealed in the last time*. Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto you *at the revelation of Jesus Christ*.

Peter then did not expect the reward till the resurrection of the dead.

Phil. 3: 8, 9, 11.—I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for whom I have suffered the loss of all things . . that I may win Christ, and be found in him, . . having the righteousness which is through the faith of Christ . . *if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead*.

Then Paul did not look for his reward until his *mortal* body should *put on* immortality.

2 Tim. 4: 8.—I have kept the faith: henceforth there is *laid up* for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord the righteous judge, shall give me *at* THAT *day*: and not to me only but unto all them that love his *appearing*.

Titus, 2: 12, 13.—We should live soberly . . . . *looking for that blessed hope*, and the GLORIOUS APPEARING of the great God, *and* our Saviour Jesus Christ.

These passages all prove that the reward was not to be expected till the Resurrection.

Christ says, "I am the resurrection and the life." Resurrection and life are co-existent, and inseparable. If no resurrection, no future life.

Luke 18: 30.—Those who had forsaken all for God's sake, should receive manifold more in this present time, and in the world to come, life everlasting.

1 Cor. 1: 7, 8.—Paul thanks God for the spiritual gifts of his Corinthian brethren, and says they are "*waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ*," who would confirm them unto "the end," that they might be blameless *in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ*.

Again; 1 Thess. 2: 19.—For what is our hope, or joy, or crown of rejoicing? Are not even ye in the *presence* of our Lord Jesus Christ *at* HIS COMING?

If these Thessalonians would be in the presence of Christ *before* his coming, would Paul have waited till the *coming of Christ* before he began to rejoice? Verily, nay.

1 Thess. 3: 12, 13.—The Lord make you . . . . to abound in love: . . . to the end he may establish your hearts unblameable in holiness before God, even our Father, *at the coming* of our Lord Jesus Christ, with all his saints.

1 Thess. 5: 23.—"I pray God your whole *spirit, and soul, and body*, be preserved blameless UNTO THE COMING *of our Lord Jesus Christ*."

As at death we end our probationary state, if Paul believed they entered into the promised reward, or any part of it immediately after death, it would have been enough for Paul to have prayed for them to be preserved to that period, as that would have sealed their everlasting destiny.

But as Paul did not believe it, he very consistently prayed that they might be preserved blameless till the resurrection.

1 Thess. 4: 13, 17.—"I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you *by the word of the Lord*, that we which are alive and remain *unto the coming of the Lord* shall NOT PREVENT (anticipate) them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up *together with them* in the clouds, TO MEET the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore, comfort one another with these words."

Here Paul, in the most solemn manner, declares *by the word of the Lord*, by express revelation, that the living at the time of Christ's coming, should arise, should meet Jesus just after the saints who were asleep had awoke to consciousness, and all at one time to meet together and continue always with Christ, and then know for the first time, after finishing their course with joy, the eternal fiat securing their eternal inheritance.

"Wherefore comfort one another with these words?" By what words? That immediately upon death your souls will go to heaven? No, no. But comfort the friends of the dead with the assurance that "*the dead shall rise again*."

1 Pet. 3: 12, 14.—"Seeing then . . . . that the elements shall melt with fervent heat . . . . what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, *looking for and hastening* unto *the coming of the day of God*, . . . be diligent that ye may be found of him in peace, without spot and blameless . . . . *when* the heavens shall be dissolved." Can I make this plainer? I leave it in almost the very words of revelation, only leaving out the extraneous parts to show the connexion.

1 John, 2: 28.—And now, little children, abide in him that, WHEN *he shall appear*, we may have confidence, and *not be ashamed before him* AT HIS COMING.

1 John, 3: 2.—We know that WHEN he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is.

In all these texts, the time of the rejoicing of the saints is expressly declared to be *at the coming of Christ to judge the world*. There is not the slightest allusion to an intermediate state of consciousness. All the expressions employed most clearly prove that the apostles believed in no such state of conscious enjoyment. That the apostles believed that the penalty of *death* had been *fully inflicted* upon all them that sleep in Jesus, is strikingly manifest, and that

"Many of them *that sleep in the dust of the earth*," . . . . upon whom the fiat of Jehovah, of "dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return," had been literally fulfilled, . . . . "*shall awake*, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."—Dan. 12: 2.

1 Cor. 16: 22.—If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema, Maran-atha. Or, as some read it: let them be accursed *at the coming of the Lord*.

Our next argument will be founded upon the places from which the dead are summoned to judgment.

FROM WHENCE ARE THE NATIONS GATHERED TOGETHER AT THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD; AND AT THE JUDGMENT WHICH THEN TAKES PLACE?

Daniel says, many shall awake that sleep in the dust of the earth. But if he had been a believer in the conscious intermediate state, he would have said, many shall come from Paradise and from hell, or he would not have been consistent.

John 5: 28.—"Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the *graves*, (not in heaven or hell,) shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life," &c.

Rev. 20: 13.—John says, "The sea gave up the *dead* which were in IT; and death and hell, (or hades, the grave,) delivered up the dead which *were in them*; and they were judged *every man* according to his works."

Death is here personified, and is represented, as having reigned with undisputed sway over the whole of man, soul and body, but now he is made to deliver up his dominion to Christ: for the last Adam, Christ, is made a *life-giving* spirit: 1 Corth. 15: 45; and the last enemy, Death, shall be destroyed: v. 26. The same may be said of Hades.

According to the common theory, death never had dominion. According to the Bible, death did reign for a time, but was vanquished by the omnipotent voice of Christ, who hath purchased life and immortality by the sacrifice of himself for the sons of men. In this text we find the dead coming from Death, and Hell, or the grave, and the sea, but none from heaven, for the plain reason that none had yet ascended there, but Christ, the first fruits.

Acts 2: 34.—"For David is not yet ascended into the heavens."

Matt. 24: 31.—And he shall send his angels with a trumpet, and a great voice, and they shall gather together his elect *from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other*."

Ez. 37: 9. "Come from the four winds, O breath, and breathe upon these slain, that they may live. . . . . And the breath came into them and they lived."

At the creation of man, his breath is represented as being breathed into him by God; at the resurrection his breath is summoned from the four winds. And as this breath is equivalent to the spirit of the breath of lives, the reanimating spirit of the re-enlivened dust was necessarily unconscious till it stimulated into activity the bodily functions of thought, motion, and feeling.

Ez. 37: 12. I will open your graves, and cause you to come UP *out of your graves*, and bring you into the land of Israel.

THE JUDGMENT.

We now proceed to show that there is but one judgment spoken of in the scriptures, and that is the general judgment: which does not take place immediately at death, but after the resurrection. To suppose the contrary, is to suppose that the judgment of many has transpired, before the persons who are to constitute the judge, and the associate judges, have formed the court, or even had an existence.

John 5: 27. The Father hath given to the Son authority to execute judgment also because he is the Son of man.

Mat. 19: 28. And ye shall set upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

1 Cor. 6: 2. Do you not know that the saints shall judge the world?

2 Tim. 4: 1. Jesus Christ shall judge the quick and dead *at his appearing* and his kingdom.

These texts show most conclusively that no sentence has yet been passed. Man had forfeited his life by sin, and how could his life be justly restored till the purchase price (the sacrifice of Christ) was paid? Yet the common belief would place David and the patriarchs in heaven. But Peter says, Acts 2: 34, "David is not ascended into the heavens." And Paul, Heb., 11: 13, says, "These all died in faith, *not having received the promises*, but having seen them AFAR OFF."

The terms used to represent the judgment are in the singular: as that day—the day—the great day—the judgment—the coming of Christ, his second coming, and such like; which terms would lose all their force, if there were an isolated, individual judgment, anticipating that day.

The term, "general judgment" is not found in the scripture, but has been brought into requisition to sustain the common belief.

"The great day" is represented in the scripture as all important; but if there were an individual judgment taking place immediately after death, it would be the first realization of the final award, and would be the awful *crisis* deciding the eternal destiny of all. This would throw the second judgment into the shade; leaving for it nothing more than to confirm what had already been done; to publish to the universe what was already known, and to reward and punish the body as well as the soul.

According to the prevalent belief, the first judgment must be the most important; and Paul who knew the terrors of the Lord, would have used arguments drawn from this first judgment, as a persuasive to repentance and a motive to faithfulness; yet he has not done this, but has used "*the* judgment of the *Great Day*."

Again, the general judgment is represented as overtaking the wicked unawares, "as a thief in the night," and they seem astonished at the results. "When saw we thee sick, &c., and did not minister unto thee." "They will call upon the rocks and the mountains to fall on them to hide them from the judge." But if they had already been suffering, some for a thousand years, they must have been perfectly aware of the future result.

*We are to show that there is but one judgment, and that judgment is after the resurrection of the dead.*

Heb. 9: 11. "For it is appointed unto men once to die, and after that the judgment."

2 Tim. 4: 1. Jesus Christ shall judge the quick and the dead *at his appearing* and his kingdom.

2 Thess. 1: 6—8. It is a righteous thing with God

to recompense .... to you who are troubled, rest with us, *when* the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints —*in that day.*

2 Thess. 2: 2. I beseech you brethren, by *the coming* of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our *gathering together* unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind.

Luke 14: 14. Invite the poor, "for they cannot recompense thee; for thou shalt be recompensed *at the resurrection of the just.*"

2 Tim. 4: 8. Henceforth there is *laid up for me* a crown of righteousness, which the Lord the righteous Judge shall give me AT THAT DAY; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his APPEARING.

Mat. 19: 27, 28. Behold we have forsaken all, and followed thee; what shall we have therefore? Answer. Honor at the judgment. Mark the term "regeneration" in the answer, which implies, to make the subject of it over again, to renew—then the old man was destroyed, body and soul, and had an existence only in Christ, in the same manner as the Jews had an existence in the loins of Abraham, to be *re-born* by a resurrection from the dust. The terms used in these texts utterly preclude the possibility of a judgment passed on the soul prior to *the great day.*

*We next show that the separation of the righteous and the wicked does not take place till the judgment.*

Mat. 25: 32. "Before him shall be gathered all nations; and he (Christ) shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats."

Mat. 15: 30. "Let the tares and the wheat grow together unto the harvest; in the time of harvest, I will say to the reapers, gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them; but gather the wheat into my barn."

This like the former is fatal to the common belief.

The prevalent belief supposes that the spirits of the saints who died before Christ, received the greater part of their reward, eternal life and joy in heaven, *before* the purchase was completed by the sufferings and death of Christ. And if God could have consistently rewarded these *before the atonement was made*, he might have dispensed with the atonement altogether: a conclusion which no judicious person will presume to draw. Besides, Christ was the *first* fruits; the common theory says, those who died before Christ rose, have arisen to heaven, and were there in their essential parts, and consequently, were the first fruits. Which will you believe, the common theory, or Paul?

1 Cor. 15: 22. "As in Adam all *die*, even so in Christ SHALL ALL BE made alive." *Shall all;* future tense.

The common theory represents these same persons as already judged by Christ, because he is the Son of Man, before he became the Son of Man; which is *manifestly impossible.*

The common theory maintains that the principal constituents of man's nature, nearly all that truly make him a man—his spirit, soul, mind, and emotions—producing consciousness, knowledge, love, and joy, or grief and pain, the *chief* culprits in sin which *caused* death—have eluded the penalty of death, and rejoice in conscious life. This is reflecting severely upon the truth and justice of God.

A man has but one identity, consisting of that incomprehensible principle we call LIFE conjoined to a material organization. Identity consists in the *union*, death in the *separation* of these parts. That man is a *unit*, while the common theory supposes that he is two or more. And that these two, or more independent existences, conspiring together to violate the law of God, one only, the body, suffers the whole penalty, while, in the righteous, the other one, or more, escape.

The image of God is impressed on spirit, soul, and body: and though I believe this image is impressed on our moral and our intellectual nature, in knowledge, yet it is more fully impressed on our animal nature, the emotions; true holiness, which is perfect love, has its seat in the heart, the centre of the living blood. Therefore the scriptures, with philosophical accuracy, say, "The LOVE of God is shed abroad in the HEART by the Holy Ghost given unto us." Can we avoid the conclusion, that if that part of our nature, which more emphatically bears the impress of the image of God, suffers corruption, and becomes unconscious, that the less honoured part of our natures will become unconscious too?

From all the foregoing we conclude, that though we cannot comprehend the nature of spirit, but, as the word translated spirit, both in the Hebrew and in the Greek, means wind or breath, which are both material, that the word of God and sound philosophy, favor in man a material origin; that the term spirit, when applied to God; as, "God is a spirit:" to angels, as, "who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire;" to man, as, "who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward;" to beasts, as, "who knoweth the spirit of the beast that goeth downward;" has a different meaning, which may hereafter be shown. And that the spirit of man, if it have an abstract, or separate existence, is not susceptible of the emotions of love, or hatred, pleasure or pain, because the material organization upon which these emotions are produced, is deranged. And it obviously has no consciousness.

As the fingers of a man's hand playing upon the keys of an organ produces music, and the music cannot be produced by the fingers without the organ; so the spirit, if it have a separate existence, has no separate conscious existence, and cannot produce ideas, action, or emotion, without the bodily organization on which these emotions depend. It is absurd to say that the spirit lives when separated from the living person. "The spirit of man that goeth upward;" and, "Into thy hands I commend my spirit;" seem to mean, that God will preserve it till the day of retribution. Their lives are hid with Christ in God. To assert that the soul has conscious being, while the body is dissolved in the grave, is directly contrary to that express declaration of the word of God, that says, "The *soul* that sinneth, IT shall *die.*"

That our soul or life, or both, which the translators of our bible have used interchangeably, considering them as synonymous terms, or nearly so, and all that give character to the man, making him good or bad, and upon which our identity depend, exist in, and animate the blood; and we say, a good heart, a bad heart, because the heart is the fountain of the blood, "and *the blood is the life.*" And that

these principles of our nature, life, soul, and emotions, suffer the extreme penalty of the law, which is death, the entire extinction of consciousness. But as our lives have been redeemed by Christ, there will be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust, and every man will *then*, and not before, receive his reward according to his works.

From these numerous arguments we confidently draw the following conclusions:

1. That the doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul is a sublime absurdity, and is as repugnant to the scripture as to enlightened reason.

2. That the doctrine of the conscious happiness or misery of the separated soul, between death and the resurrection, or the poetical "spirit-land," with all its etherial bodies of light and glory, is a cunningly devised fable, derived from pagan sources, and slightly modified by the Mother of Harlots, and too generally prevalent, because all nations have drank too deeply of the wine of the wrath of her fornication.

3. That immortality can only be obtained as a gift from God through Jesus Christ.

4. That the dead saints will not put on immortality till the Son of God comes in the clouds of heaven to raise the dead, and to change their corrupted bodies into incorruptible or spirit-bodies.

5. That the doctrines of the natural immortality of the soul, and of the intermediate state of consciousness has been fostered by a false and exploded system of philosophy; and encouraged by the pride of the human heart, which arrogates to itself independence of its Maker, immortality of existence, and power to elude the just sentence of the violated law; that they are calculated to rob God, "who only hath immortality," of part of his honor, and part of his truth, and part of his justice, and that the promulgation of them is subversive of the scriptures, and promotive of infidelity. And that as they could not stand the test of a thorough examination; but being smitten by the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God, and exposed to the light of the sun of truth, they must soon vanish away,

> "And like the baseless fabric of a vision,
> Leave not a wreck behind."

6. That the doctrine of life and immortality, only in Jesus Christ, by a resurrection from the dead, is firmly established, and must exist long as eternal ages roll, and ye cannot overthrow it, lest haply ye be found equal to fight against God.

However humiliating it may be to the pride of men to be shorn of their immortality; yet God called "*their* name," the name of the race "Adam," red earth, while in a state of innocence; but man soon earned for himself another name, "Enosh," a wretched mortal, which has continued to be the appropriate name of the race since. And now ye boasters of the inherent dignity of human nature, say not that you are degraded to beasts, and instead of condemning your earthly origin, let it be known to you that the most insignificant insect that flutters in the summer's sun, or the vilest reptile that crawls in the slime of the earth, better fulfils the design of God in its creation, and consequently holds a more dignified station in the scale of being, than that man, who, despising the plan of God for his true moral elevation, chooses to degrade himself by grovelling in the dust of sensuality and ignominy, and will not come unto Christ that he may live for ever. But to the better disposed we will say, that the true dignity of man does not consist in the scope of his faculties, in the immateriality, or the inherent immortality of his soul and spirit, but in the *purity of his moral nature*, and that though he shall *surely die, body, soul, and spirit*, yet we are commanded to "comfort one another with these words," that though thousands of years may intervene, during which time he shall sleep in Jesus, be utterly unconscious, yet this period will appear but a moment, and his flesh may rest in hope that "*the dead shall rise again.*"

Therefore commit the keeping of your souls unto Him as a faithful Creator, who shall change these vile bodies, that they may be fashioned like unto his own glorious body.

Yet notwithstanding man's earthly origin, and that he is made for a little while, a little lower than the angels, when the righteous rise from the dead, they shall be crowned with glory, honor, and immortality, at God's right hand, and shall occupy the most exalted station of any creature in God's intelligent universe.

Therefore, my beloved fellow-mortals, be entreated to come unto Christ that you *may live for ever*, and "by patient continuance in well doing, SEEK FOR glory, honor, and *immortality*;" and "WHEN Christ, who is our LIFE, shall appear, THEN shall ye also appear with him in glory."

"Objections" will next be considered.

## LIFE IN CHRIST.

By Edward White, England.

We have made several attempts to proceed with our extracts from this work, but have been defeated by the scantiness of our columns. In this number, however, we have resumed our effort, and hope not to be obliged to discontinue it. We shall give large extracts, but do not endorse every sentiment contained in them; and we judge Br. White will have occasion, hereafter, to think differently on some points. But the grand leading truth is most nobly and forcibly expressed and illustrated, *viz*: "*Immortality is the peculiar privilege of the Regenerate*": *or*, "*Life in Christ*," *alone*, for Adam's race. The following extract is a continuation of one terminating in the Examiner, page 84, Vol. V.

We now pass on to consider the TRIAL OF ADAM IN THE GARDEN OF EDEN.

Few persons are to be found in the present enlightened age, so uninstructed, as to suppose that the sin of Adam was the procuring cause of death to the animal population of the world. The most cursory and superficial glance at the constitution of nature suffices to convince the observant Christian, that this globe, so far at least as the inferior races are concerned, was originally created a mortal system. Grass was not "brought forth" to grow, nor flowers and trees to bloom in undying verdure through eternity: but the green herb was intended to wither, and the leaves to fade and "fall away." Thus, likewise, were insects made; some to flutter for a few hours in the breeze and sunshine; some to prolong their existence through the circle of a year; some to extend their lives through several seasons; but each and all at length, together

with every rank of creatures above them, to return unto the dust from whence they were taken. Besides, all nature constitutes one vast system of prey; birds, beasts, fishes, and insects, alike finding their appropriate food, to an incalculable extent, in subordinate races; and evincing, from their internal construction and organization, that this was the original intention of God. But a system of prey involves and implies a system of universal mortality; and, be it remembered, this system was framed before the creation of man.

Geology also confirms us in the belief, that such has been the character of this world's population through innumerable ages preceding the establishment of its present condition; the remains of countless animals, both terrestrial and marine, lying imbedded in the ancient rocks, in the "earliest part of the dust of the earth;" and even, in some instances, actually forming their substances through accumulation at the bottom of the former seas.

By these considerations, therefore, we are firmly convinced, that when Adam was placed upon the earth by his Creator, he was introduced into the midst of an already mortal and perishable system. "*The things seen were temporal.*" Vicissitude, succession, generation, and decay, were the grand laws of the world, notwithstanding its order and loveliness, when it emerged for the last time from the bosom of darkness, as the habitation of man. Death reigned, although without its terrors, over the whole sublunary creation. Since, then, Adam was formed from the dust of a mortal world, with an animal frame-work at least remarkably analogous in its structure to those of the animated orders around him, and with a mind not altogether devoid of resemblance to beings with "less understanding," which races themselves displayed a gradation of intelligence; if any presumption may be expressed before proceeding to examine the record, it certainly is not in favor of Man's essential immortality; for on that supposition, he would have been the only exception to the universal rule of mortality; himself, at the same time, not possessing a nature which obviously raised him at once beyond and above the suspicion of possibly sharing the destiny of the world whose air he breathed, however the distinguishing glory of reason and religion might prove and illustrate his supremacy over it.

But what says the record? "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the earth, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul. And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed. And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. And the Lord God took the man and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it, and to keep it. And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree in the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die."—Gen. ii.

The first observation suggested by the words of the sacred historian, is, that Adam was not formed within the precincts of Paradise; but was created in the territory without, where no tree of life was found; and that afterwards he was placed in the garden of Eden, to dress it and to keep it. The circumstance of the formation of Adam in a region where nothing appeared to symbolize the possibility of rising above the level of the universal mortality, seems to point us to the frequently repeated conclusion, that he was not created in any part of his nature an indestructible being.

The tree of knowledge of good and evil, has exercised the curiosity of sacred critics in every age; but the most natural and obvious account of it appears to be, that it was a tree, by touching or refraining from which, our first parents might demonstrate whether they would lead a life of faith in God or not. It would seem to have been conveyed to them that the tasting of this tree would communicate to them, in some occult manner or mysterious sense, that knowledge of good and evil for themselves, which now they were required to receive upon the authority of God. Simple, therefore, as the elements of the temptation were, all of those great principles were involved in their probation, which have been illustrated in subsequent times in the most momentous trials of their descendants: the claims of Divine Law, the supremacy of the creative will, the obligation to universal obedience as the very essence of piety, and the rule of choice between the inducements of pride, passion or the allurements of falsehood, and the holy commandments of the Supreme.

The tree of life, in the midst of the garden, appears to have been accessible to Adam until the hour of his transgression; for we read that permission was granted to eat of *every* tree of the garden, with the single exception of the tree of knowledge. The effect of the tree of life seems to have been to repair perpetually the decays of nature, and to prevent the approach of death; so that, since we are given to understand the result of man's "putting forth his hand and taking of it," after his fall, would have been his "living for ever," we may undoubtedly conclude that Divine Goodness had destined for Adam, had he obeyed the Creator, the magnificent inheritance of IMMORTALITY.

It is scarcely necessary to discuss the disputed questions, wherefore the gift of eternal life was communicated through so extraordinary a medium as a tree in a mortal world; and whether, after a period of probation, the great ancestor of mankind would have been made "equal to the angels," and translated to heaven? It is of more importance to seize the leading ideas concerning the nature and the result of his moral probation.

We venture to suppose, then, that from the account furnished by Moses, a plain reader would naturally understand that Adam was not created under a definite sentence of death, as was the case with the remainder of the creation around him, since the boundless prospect of eternal life was open to him on condition of obedience during his trial. In other words, we should rest in the conviction, that the first man was not created absolutely immortal, but was placed on probation, in order to become so. Viewed as he was in himself, we behold a noble being,—the special "offspring" of the Divinity,—endowed with capacities for ruling over and subjugating the surrounding world, and for holding communion with God; but as to his origin, his "foundation was in the dust," and the image of the Creator was wonderfully impressed upon a nature but one remove above the "beasts which perish." His upright form and "human face divine,"

gave token of the presence of a spirit formed for intercourse with Heaven; yet his feet rested on the same vile earth which gave support to all the "creeping things" which it brought forth, and, like the inferior subjects of his dominion, "his breath was in his nostrils."

Thus was Adam placed in Paradise; midway between the angels and the animals, on trial for everlasting life; midway between mortality and immortality; midway between an existence which was as a shadow that declineth, a vapor that vanisheth away; and one, of which it should be beyond the powers even of angelic arithmetic to calculate or describe the duration. With what unutterable interest must the spectators in heaven have awaited the issue; but how far more important was it to ourselves! When we attempt to conceive of the heights and depths of blessedness which are necessarily associated with the very idea of a life prolonged to eternity in the image of God, of those "rivers of pleasure which are at his right hand for evermore," of that "far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory" which would have been the reward of obedience; and contrast all this with the sudden dishonors of death and corruption, in the "blackness of darkness for ever." with the awful alternative of everlasting destruction, like the brute or the worm, and the endless contempt of the intelligent universe at the remembrance of a name handed down for a "curse and a hissing," what mind can adequately comprehend the fearful and profound significance of the trial of Adam in the garden of Eden? But when, to such reflections on his individual destiny, we add the overwhelming consideration, that in his hand were placed, as it were, countless millions of similar immortalities, which he might gain or lose for his descendants, language shrinks from the endeavor to give utterance to that sense of INFINITE LOSS which is involved in the conception of his failure. To lose immortality for himself, was an event calamitous enough to bewilder the intelligent creation; but to lose it for a world, was an issue so tremendous as to move even the most Righteous Judge to the mysterious condescension of sacrificing his Son for its prevention.

These reflections, however, are founded upon the assumption of that which must be first more particularly investigated, the literal interpretation of the threatening held out to Adam on his admission into Paradise—"In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die."

A person who had not previously formed any acquaintance with the commentaries of modern divines would, in all probability, be astonished to understand that the threateniug of death was explained, by the New Testament revelation, to signify something different from a literal loss of life, something less than a dissolution and utter destruction of Adams nature as a man. It can scarcely be thought very likely that the terms of the menace would suggest, under all the circumstances, to an ordinary reader of those "common people" for whom the Bible was written, any other idea than that which has been assumed as the true one,—that the offender should endure the penalty of capital punishment, and forfeit the prospect of immortal life for his sin, *in the day* when he ate of the forbidden tree. There seems to be nothing in the language employed which could have conveyed to an ordinary reader, one would think, any other conception than that the punishment for the transgression was *immediate destruction*. There is no intimation of a prolonged existence to be afterwards permitted, either in time or eternity; for the threatening is brief, direct, decisive; "In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." Since Adam was not yet immortal, the signification could not be, as is sometimes supposed, that in the day of his sin he should "become mortal," (for that which is not yet immortal, incapable of death, must be mortal already,) and, therefore, nothing remains except to receive the terms in their grammatical sense, "In the day, the very day, of thy transgression, thou shalt be destroyed from the presence of the Lord."

It will probably be admitted, that the sense in which the first man would have understood the threatening of death was the true one; for it would be difficult to reconcile it either with the justice or the mercy of the Almighty, if He were imagined to deliver the sanctions and menaces of His holy law to a newly-created and most feebie being, in enigmas, which were beyond the grasp of his faculties, and whose real meaning surpassed in horror the apprehension of every intellect but the Omniscient. Now it would appear, so far as we are capable of forming a judgment in this case, that unless Adam were inspired with the knowledge of a different signification, he could affix no other interpretation to the word "death," than that to which he was accustomed, when he employed it in relation to the mortal system around him. Life and death must have been opposites to him, as to us; and surely, in the infancy of language, and the awful crisis of a world, we can scarcely imagine that words would be employed in a curious metaphorical sense, altogether opposed to their plain, primary signification. With whatever facility, therefore, the readers of modern times can dismiss the clear notion of death in the employment of the term, and substitute that of misery ever-during, to the exclusion of the idea of destruction, we cannot impute the same extraordinary process of thought to the protoplast, but must conclude that, beyond all reasonable contradiction, he would have understood the threatening to convey the terrific conception of a dissolution of his nature for ever.

And when we add to this, the reflection, that in all probability Adam had no distinct idea of his soul, as capable of a separate existence, apart from his body, but conceived of it as his life, using the same term to express the two different conceptions of *breath* and *spirit*, we shall find a still greater difficulty in supposing that he could have been metaphysical enough to conclude that death *signified death* for his body, and everlasting life in misery for that "understanding which was in his inward parts." But if Adam could not have understood the threatening thus, without some special revelation to enable him to do so, and if that revelation does not appear in the record, it assuredly follows that we have no right to make a gratuitous supposition of its existence, but must interpret the words so as to avoid the otherwise inevitable impeachment of the preventive justice of the Supreme. For if the Chinese government, in a land of but semi-civilization, considers itself obliged to read to the people, periodically, the criminal code, in order that they may know exactly what to expect as its punishments, it would ill become us to impute to the Highest Tribunal in the universe a concealment of the true meaning of that tremendous sanction of law, under which Adam in Paradise commenced his probation.

Yet, notwithstanding the existence of these arguments, and of abundant controversy in their favour, this threatening is metaphorically understood by the churches in modern times. It is alleged by eminent divines, whose names must ever be mentioned with the highest respect, that whether Adam understood the meaning or not, the menace of death conveyed the compound idea of literal dissolution for his body, called temporal death, and of everlasting existence in misery for his disembodied soul. This latter portion of the curse is denominated spiritual death, and is conceived to combine the triple notion of eternal life, moral degradation, and consequent misery in alienation from the Father of spirits. It was supposed to follow necessarily, as a consequence from the immortality of the soul, which was itself an appointment of God; and in respect to the term "death," by which it was denoted, it is further alleged, that it was "the most eligible to express such an idea in the whole extent of language." By these interpreters the expression, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," is taken to signify, not death in the day of transgression, but only a liability to death of the body at some future time; so that the life of Adam being prolonged, and a race in his own image springing from him, that race is born "by nature children of wrath," which of course, on this theory, may be received as conveying the idea, that they are born liable not only to death of the body, but also to everlasting misery of the soul, or death "in all its senses."

(To be Continued.)

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, MARCH, 1851.

BIBLE EXAMINER. *"Second Edition," for February.*—By special request, we published some thousands extra of the February Examiner. If any wish to scatter them, they can be had *without charge*; but we solicit donations, from any who are able, to help meet the expense. All communications for these must be made without expense to us.

---

"ALL SOUL."—What is "*all soul?*" S. B. Loomis, a correspondent of the True Wesleyan, of February 15th, in commending books published by that denomination says:—

"And there is Lee on the Soul. The book itself is all soul; a dead shot on the new, vamped infidelity of this age of new things."

There are a few things in this short sentence we will just notice, inasmuch as the Wesleyan says "HEAR BROTHER LOOMIS." We do "hear him:" and first, his character of the book—"*It is* ALL SOUL." Of course, in this case, the Wesleyan is good authority in defining "*soul.*" Its definition of it is—"That it is a simple essence, immaterial, uncompounded, and indivisible." "Lee on the Soul," then, is first, "immaterial:" *not matter!* Very well, we will not quarrel about that; it may be so. What next? Why, it is "*uncompounded:*" not put together; it always existed just as it is! Well, that may be so. But then the book is improperly named, for that which is uncompounded had no beginning—it is not a production of any being. No finite being can produce an uncompounded thing, whatever the Infinite might do. "Uncompounded!" that is, it is *nothing.* Very well, perhaps "Bro. Loomis" is right. But "the soul is indivisible:" that is—it cannot be separated into parts. We believe, however, that "Lee on the Soul" is divided into several parts, or chapters. If not, "Anthropos" has *dissected* it, and found it susceptible of being divided. If any doubt this, let them procure "The Unity of Man—A Reply to Luther Lee, by Anthropos," published at our office; price 15 cents. If that does does not convince them that "Lee on the Soul" is not "*all* soul," it will at least satisfy them that Lee's definition of soul is not correct.

Second.—"The book is" not only "all soul," but, says "Bro. Loomis," it is "a dead shot on the new, vamped infidelity," &c. Now, as "the book" is an attempt to show that all men are immortal, without any regard to the fact of their being in Christ, in the opinion of "Bro. Loomis" to teach and preach Christ as our life, in whom alone we have immortality, and out of whom all will perish, is "infidelity." He must have strange notions of infidelity. He has probably mistaken the serpent's preaching for the gospel. We affirm, in contradicto to the "old serpent," and all his admirers, "the *soul* that sinneth, IT shall die."

This truth forms the sum total of what "Bro. Loomis" is pleased to call "new, vamped infidelity." In other words—a dissent from the old serpent is infidelity, in his opinion. Well, "Lee on the Soul is a dead shot on" *such* "infidelity." It happens, however, that men differ in opinion, and not a few think the "dead shot" killed by *rebounding.* Be that as it may, we know that what "Bro. Loomis" is pleased to call "new, vamped infidelity" does not show any signs of being "*dead,*" or dying; no, nor of ever having received a wound. So far from it, it never has been in a more lively and flourishing condition than at present; and is likely to live and grow while the truth of God remains, that the sinner "*shall surely die.*"

---

QUESTION.—*Brother Storrs*—I see that you and Brother Marsh, as well as many others, quote Daniel 7th, 27, as though the "*people* of the saints, were the saints." Are the children of Silas Cook, Silas Cook? or, in other words—do they not include the same as Romans 4th chap., 4th and 5th verses?

SILAS COOK.

"The children of Silas Cook" are not "Silas Cook." Yet, the connection in Daniel seventh indicates, we think, that it is "the saints," themselves, to whom "the kingdom" is given. In verse 18, it is said—"The Saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom," &c. Verse 22 it is added—

"The time came that the saints possessed the kingdom." Then at the 27th verse, as it reads in the Septuagint, it is said—"And the kingdom, and the power, and the greatness of the kings that are under the whole heaven were given to the saints of the Most High," &c. This language corresponds with the 18th and 22nd verses, and seems to be the true sense of the passage. If Bro. Cook thinks otherwise he has a right to do so.

---

ASLEEP IN JESUS.—Just as our last paper went to press, we were called to the sad office of closing the eyes of one of our beloved brethren, in this city —Henry Reiter. His death was sudden; being in usual health till the last twenty-four hours prior to his decease. We knew nothing of his sickness till called to his house, about one hour before he breathed his last. We stood by and closed his eyes with a melancholy feeling, but in the lively recollection that Jesus has said—"I am the resurrection and the life." His sickness was short, and painful in the extreme; but he expressed himself resigned, and that he had been living for such an hour. He has left a deeply afflicted widow, and a babe. We, as a church, deeply feel his loss. Always in his place, and a leading singer, we cannot but observe his vacant seat. But we bow in submission to the will of God, and wait for that day when our "*brother shall rise again.*" He fell asleep in the full belief of the resurrection at the last day, and that till then he would sleep. Nor is there any other "gloom" in the idea of unconsciousness in death than what God has been pleased should hang about the penalty of the first transgression. Our Creator and Law-giver never designed that death should be pleasant; were it so, it would fail to be a *penalty.* But our gracious God has bid believers in Jesus to look beyond death to *the resurrection:* that is our hope, and to be realized only at the return of our Lord from heaven. "Wherefore comfort one another with *these words;*" not with the vain imagination that our friends have gone to heaven when they die. No; they "sleep in Jesus;" if no resurrection, no hope. But, blessed be God, "If we believe that Jesus *died* and *rose again*, even so. also, *them* that sleep in Jesus will God bring with him" from the dead; for, "the God of peace brought again from *the dead* our Lord Jesus Christ, that great shepherd of the sheep;" and it is from thence he will bring, in the last day, all the members of Christ's body.

---

"A HISTORY OF THE SPIRIT RAPPINGS *in Cincinnati and other places,*" *etc.*—We have received this pamphlet, on which we had to pay fifteen cents postage; just *fifteen cents* more than it is worth. And then we had to tax ourself several hours reading to plod through it. The author of the work let out the secret of his superstition in few words, in his "introduction." He says:—

"In the statement that *mind, escaped from the body,* does communicate with mind yet in the body, there was nothing that conflicted with any *theological notions* I held, and whenever I witnessed 'manifestations' that I was satisfied were not produced by mortal agencies, *I was prepared* to believe that they might be 'spiritual manifestations.'"

His "theological notions *prepared*" him to believe that the Serpent's lies were God's truth; for God has plainly declared "there is *no knowledge* in she'ol"—the state of the dead: but the Serpent boldly affirms, "Ye shall not surely die"—the "mind escaped from the body," has intelligence, and can "communicate with mind in the body!" We have only room now for two extracts from the work before us. In one communication, recorded page 79, we have the following:—

"The 'manifestations' that had been made, and those which were immediately to follow, with convincing power, were forerunners of that time prophesied in holy writ, as the second coming of Christ. *He would be manifested with his holy angels through those circles of spirits,* which shall cause the demonstrations spoken of."

Here is a professed respect for "holy writ," but a blasphemous assumption that Christ is to be manifested "through those circles of spirits" who are making these "demonstrations." That they are "forerunners of that time prophesied in holy writ as the second coming of Christ," we do not doubt; not, however, because they say so; but because "holy writ" prophecies of a character making "manifestations" with "all power and signs, and lying wonders; and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness *in them that perish*" * * * who "should believe a lie: that they all might be damned who believed not the truth," &c. When Christ actually comes he will destroy this man of sin, now working and making "manifestations;" and with him, all his devotees, for their rejection of the truth of God.

Compare the foregoing extract with the following, found on page 136 of this work. It is among questions to and answers from these spirits "*through*" whom "the second coming o Christ" is to take place:—

"Question. Do Spirits worship a superior being? Answer. They all reverence perfection in nature, and acknowledge a superior power, or the *great Positive*, but know nothing about a being that they must both fear and love, as taught by orthodox creeds of the day."

Here is a plain denial of the "being" of God. Truly "there is no *fear* of God before their eyes," nor "love" to God either. In the same catalogue of questions and answers is the following:—

"Q.—Is the spirit of a human being ever lost?

A.—Never. All that once live, always live, and grow better and brighter in the spiritual state."

Here is the "*Peace and Safety*" cry. And Paul saith—"When they shall say peace and safety, then sudden destruction cometh upon them * * and they shall not escape."

We have not time to notice this pamphlet any further now; and the general subject we must let come into our articles on "*Mysterious Rappings*," which will be continued in the Examiner a while longer, or as long as in our judgment it is necessary to expose this last Satanic "demonstration," and guard our readers against being ensnared in this "mystery of iniquity." Yet we have no safety only by cleaving closely to "the Lord Jehovah, in whom is everlasting strength."

---

"HERALD OF THE KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME: *A Periodical devoted to the Interpretation of the 'Law and Testimony,' and to the Defence of the 'Faith once Delivered to the Saints.'* By JOHN THOMAS, M. D., Richmond, Va."—Such is the title-page of a Periodical commenced by Dr. Thomas, since he returned from his long absence to England. Terms, $2 00 for twelve numbers, containing about the same amount of matter as the Examiner. We presume it will be conducted with ability, though we have not had time thoroughly to examine the first number since its reception.

---

## "MYSTERIOUS RAPPINGS."

[Continued from page 10.]

We have long had suspicion that clairvoyance, especially that induced by Pathetism, was the result of connection with "evil spirits." We say *evil* spirits, because, it does pretend to make developments of spiritual things and of scenes in heaven and elsewhere, which, if real, can be no less than *revelation*; and as the volume which we, as christians, acknowledge is really a revelation from God winds up with the most awful denunciation on such as "add unto these things" (Rev. 22: 18,) we are satisfied none but "evil spirits" will attempt any such additions. But clairvoyants and the "*knocking* spirits" are professionally giving higher revelations and more full than the Bible does. Take the following example: it is found in "The Spirit Messenger," page 76; in speaking of "the spirit in its relations to the body," it says:

"When by any natural tendency, or the direct influence of a foreign person, the system of an individual is demagnetized and thrown into an unconscious state; when the subtle fluid which unites the spiritual with the material is so withdrawn that the senses are buried in entire oblivion, and no impression is conveyed through them to the organs of the brain, the soul then awakes to an innate consciousness, acts independently of the bodily organization, and lives in a higher world of thought and feeling." * * * * "These evidences of the independent action of the soul, have been given to a greater or less extent in all ages; and were the manifestations of this truth *in our day* and generation, so carefully noted *as were the dreams and visions of ancient prophecy*, we should soon compile *another* volume replete with *inspiration* OF HIGHER IMPORTANCE *than is found in pages now deemed* so SACRED."

The emphasis on this extract is ours, that the eye of the reader may see at once the spirit of these new developments. It is not merely to supersede the "sacred" Bible, but to give something of "*higher importance.*" That is its aim; and to "exalt itself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped." None but "evil spirits" can do this; and the expression "*another* volume" is very significant; and shows that Paul was truly inspired of God when he spoke of "*another* gospel;" and said, "If any man, or an angel from heaven, preach *any other* gospel unto you than that ye have received, *let him be* ACCURSED."

Mr. Sunderland—in the Spiritual Philosopher, page 58, in his address "*To my Spiritual Children,*" by which, as we have before said, he means those who have come under his influence by Pathetism, or magnetism—makes the acknowledgment and glories in it, that he was aided by invisible agents in the wonderful feats he performed by Pathetism and clairvoyance. After speaking of the benefit he had conferred by the relief or cure of various diseases, he adds:

"Nor is this all, nor, indeed, is it the best, the chief good, you have realized from Pathetism. You are conscious of having had your mind developed into superior degrees of goodness and truth. You are more happy, more contented, more grateful, more hopeful. And, O, how my spirit swelled with emotions of satisfaction, when I was told by a 'Host of Spirits,' with whom I conversed in Auburn, Aug. 9, 1850, that *they had often been present at my lectures* in Boston, Philadelphia, New York, Providence, and other places: *attracted by the approach of those spirits whom I had pathetised into a state of* TRANCE!" * * "Those spirits also assured me that they had stood by me, and witnessed the surgical operations I had caused to be performed on my *entranced* children, in my public lectures on Pathetism! Yes" * * "they had" * * "been present, rejoicing in the assistance they were enabled to afford me, in rendering my patients *insensible to pain*," &c.

We give this extract to show, what we have long suspected, that some kind of invisible agents were concerned in this matter. Mr. Sunderland thinks these agents are good spirits; we have no doubt they are "evil spirits;" now more fearfully than ever *transforming* themselves "into angels of light" and as far as possible into angels of love—to deceive men, and thus more easily to captivate, and lead them to place implicit confidence in their revelations and "mandates." Thus far they have

gone, and "prevailed" with our old friend Mr. Sunderland. What they bid him do, he performs! What they prohibit, he avoids! Thus, for example, in the Philosopher, page 89, he says:

"The Spiritual Philosopher was originated in the Spirit World, and is conducted under the direct supervision and advice of 'Hosts of Friends in the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh spheres above.' *It belongs to the Spirit World*, and is the first paper ever published, expressly designed for giving 'Responses' from the 'Higher Spheres of Intelligence.'"

This language is strong—it speaks for itself. Mr. Sunderland is *only* an *agent!* The *mandates* of his *employers* are to be strictly obeyed; their "DIRECT SUPERVISION" is not an unmeaning thing! His consecration to what he calls "the good and the true" among them—and no others presume to approach him!—is *perfect* and *entire*. No christian could be more entirely consecrated to "God and the Lamb." Henceforth, "in the love" of these spirits he "*lives and moves and has his being.*" See his prayer, which we have recorded. It is true, for a time they may not allow him to think that they are doing anything more than to "*advise*" him; but that will only tend the more fatally to hide their evil character and designs. It must and it will ultimate—unless he is aroused to a sense of his danger—in his *unqualified* submission to their mandates. We say not these things in any other spirit than that of kindness and good will to him. We love him still, notwithstanding the awful precipice on the verge of which we see him stand. It is true, we *fear* he is too far gone for recovery; still we have a lingering *hope* that his eyes may yet be opened to see "the TRUE *Light*"—viz; Jesus Christ—which, it is most manifest, he has lost sight of, and beholds no more. O, that God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, may, in infinite mercy interpose to call back our old friend, and once a beloved brother in Christ, from the pit to which he is hastening as a bird to a snare. But if he is not arrested, we have hope, and a certainty, that others, who might have been ensnared as he is, will be saved by our effort to unveil this embryotic development of the last and terrible "*Anti-Christ*"—the REAL "*Man of Sin.*"

(To be continued.

---

MR. SUNDERLAND'S BELIEF.—The True Wesleyan of Feb. 8th, contained the following item of information:—

"REV. GEORGE STORRS ON SPIRITUAL KNOCKINGS.—Our old friend, Bro. Storrs, in his Bible Examiner, is reviewing Mr. Sunderland's spiritual knockings. He has made some very just remarks, but in one matter of fact he appears to labor under a mistake. He says of Mr. Sunderland's conversion to the new spiritual theory,

'It will be seen that he was prepared for it by his belief in the natural immortality theory.'

Mr. Sunderland was not a believer in the natural immortality of the soul, or in any other immortality of humanity at the time of his conversion. He did not believe that man possesses a soul. He told us, in our own office, that man has no spiritual element in his composition, and that what we call the mind, is only a function of the brain. When he got converted to a belief in the spirtual knockings he called at our office and told us the result of his visit to the room of the spirits, and we charged home upon him his former denial of the existence of spirits, upon which he confessed that his former declaration was an error, that he was now convinced by the spiritual knockings that man has a soul, which lives after the body is dead."

We give Br. Lee, of the Wesleyan, full credit for accuracy in his statement. We regret, however, that Mr. Sundeland is placed in such a position by it: for it certainly shows that he did not know what he believed. The following words of Mr. S., found in the Examiner for January, page 9, and quoted from Mr. Sunderland's own account of his conversion to "Spirit Knockings," place his views in a different light from his statement to Br. Lee. The words are these:

"My views of the *spirit-world*, since their death," [the death of his two sons, the last of whom died in 1841] "had taught me, indeed, how vastly they must have progressed in that sphere beyond what they could have reached had they remained here."

It was on this testimony, of Mr. S., that we said, in the language quoted from the Examiner by the Wesleyan,—"It will be seen that he [Mr. Sunderland] was prepared for it [conversion to spirit knockings] by his belief in the natural immortality theory."

Our readers can see that our statement was correct if Mr. S.'s *public* statement was to be depended on. Br. Lee Lee says, his *private* statement to him was, that he was not a believer in the natural immortality of the soul, or in any other immortality of humanity at the time of his conversion to these "Spiritual Knockings." This certainly places Mr. Sunderland in an unenviable light. Perhaps he can explain. Deeply as he has fallen through the deception of the *lying* "spirits," we really desire that he may be cleared of the imputation of contradictory statements. We sincerely mourn over Mr. Sunderland's fall and apostacy; and earnestly pray, "if it be possible," that he may yet be brought to see that he is "crucifying the Son of God afresh," and bringing upon himself "swift destruction."

If Mr. S. did deny the immortality of the soul, as Br. Lee says, he did not do so because he learned it from the scriptures, as he should and might have done. Had he *thus* learned it, his "conversion to the new spiritual theory" would have been impossible from spirit *knockers*. When our faith stands in the wisdom and truth of God, it is not shaken by lying spirits who "go about seeking whom they may devour." Whatever Mr. S.'s belief was on

immortality, prior to his turning after these familiar spirits, it was not a faith founded on the Bible, but on Pathetism: hence he was so easy a victim.

*"No immortality—no future life, except by the resurrection—and no endless life out of Christ"*—and a firm persuasion of these truths as the teaching of the Bible—is a strong tower against all the assaults of Satan, with his legions of lying spirits, whether they *speak, mutter, or knock.*

---

## DIALOGUES ON FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

By Rev. Wm. Glen Moncrieff.

These Dialogues we republished some months since. They are Seven in number, making a Pamphlet of 60 pages, 12mo. Price 15 cents, with the usual discount to those who buy by the quantity. We know it is a work of great value, and ought to be placed in every house in the land.

The following is the Second in the Series.

*Rufus.*—Since I had the happiness of conversing with you, I have been searching the Scriptural proofs that man is immortal irrespective of character, but no explicit statements that such is the fact can be discovered by me. In the remarkable and correct language of Archbishop Whately of Dublin, "It is certain that the words 'life,' 'eternal life,' 'immortality,' &c., are always applied to the condition of those, and of those only, who shall, at the last day, be approved as good and faithful servants, who are to enter into the joy of their Lord." But do you not think that an argument in favor of man's unconditional immortality can be drawn from the fact that he is said to have been originally created in the image of God! Gen. i. 26. "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness."

*Persis.*—None, unless the Bible has explained the phrase "image of God" to mean immortality. 'Tis mere assumption that it designates man as an immortal being; for where, in all the volume, is it so interpreted? There can be no doubt that God is immortal—He "ALONE hath immortality"—and there can be as little that a creature, endowed with immortality, would so far have been made in his image; but what authority has any person to assert that this is the particular feature of resemblance between man and his Creator marked out by the language in question? Since God is a pure spirit—independent—self-existent—omnipotent—omniscient—infallible—irresponsible—unchangeable,—another person may select one or all of the other features in the divine nature, and maintain that man was produced with one or all of them, because he is declared to have been at first formed in the "image of God." Now, why select immortality in preference to any of the rest?

But, again, it is worthy of observation, that even if we were to admit "the image of God," in which man was created, to be immortality, a question arises, did he not lose this image through rebellion? does he not now need to be created afresh in the image of his Maker? Speaking of the Colossian Christians, Paul affirms they had "Put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him."—Col. iii. 10. If by man's creation in "the image of God" we are to understand his being made immortal, from the text we learn that the Colossians had, through faith in Jesus, re-acquired immortality, which had been forfeited by our first parents in Eden; so that to explain the words "image of God" to represent man as an immortal creature, is just to grant that immortality is conditional, not natural, to our race.

*Rufus.*—What do you think the most natural meaning of the phrase "image of God?"

*Persis.*—I would suggest that the proper answer is holiness; of course involving the creation and possession of the faculties necessary to a rational, accountable agent. Such, as far as I am able to determine, is the sense in which the Almighty used the words at first, "Let us make man in our image." Of course, it is not necessary to create faculties to men now, since they already are endowed with them—they only need to have them repaired and re-balanced; in other words, men need to be restored to holiness through the faith of the gospel. This is the image of God, according to Paul, in the verse quoted from his epistle to the Colossians, "Put on the new man which is renewed by *knowledge* after the image of him that created him;" to which we may add his words to the Ephesians, chap. iv. 24, "Put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." To sum up the argument, 'tis plain that if the expression "image of God" originally intimated that man was immortal, the Holy Spirit, in the passage just quoted, assures us that immortality must be re-obtained by us, or else the phrase itself does not prove men to have been created immortal.

*Rufus.*—In reading the beginning of Genesis, when reflecting on the passage you have just explained, I had my attention called to another verse. "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul."—Gen. ii. 7. May I ask you if any dependence could be placed on this declaration, in support of this popular doctrine of man's absolute immortality?

*Persis.*—No, Rufus, for the all-important word, "immortal," is not found in the verse. Had it read, "man became a living (*immortal*) soul," the question would not have admitted debate. Should any one lay down the principle that whatever anything becomes, it eternally remains so, I doubt not he might reason logically from this verse in favor of man's unconditional immortality; but I may leave you to judge if his reasoning would be solid and true.

*Rufus.*—Forbid that I should build my hope of immortality on such a foundation!

*Persis.*—While we are lingering a while at the commencement of the revelation, will you go with me and contemplate for a few moments longer the extraordinary arrangements and events of Eden?

*Rufus.*—With pleasure, I shall attend you in all your movements.

*Persis.*—Listen, then, to these words:—"And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."—Gen. ii. 16, 17. "And when the woman saw that the tree (of the knowledge of good and evil) was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eye, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with

her, and he did eat."—Gen. iii. 6. "And the Lord God said, behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and LIVE FOR EVER: Therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken. So he drove out the man: and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden, Cherubims, and a flaming sword, which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life."—Gen. iii. 22, 23, 24.

A much longer examination than we can at present make of these verses, and of the whole record about the fall, would be necessary to clear up some points which are generally obscured; still a few observations of a plain character may not be altogether useless. And *first*, then, my Rufus will observe what man in Eden was a candidate for—It was IMMORTALITY; and I found this on the reason given by Jehovah, why man, after sinning, was debarred from the tree of life,—lest he should eat of it and LIVE FOR EVER. He was not immortal by creation, therefore. On no account would I assert that the living for ever of his soul was connected with the eating of the tree of life, though the fruit of it was likely intended to exert a greater preserving influence on his animal frame than is commonly supposed. "That man," says Archbishop Whately, "was originally created of an immortal nature, and that our first parents would have been exempt from death, but for a change introduced into their nature at the fall, is by some persons taken for granted very hastily. The Scripture account, in Genesis, rather implies the contrary: namely, that they were to be preserved from death, by the continual use of a certain medicine (as it may be called) appointed for that purpose,—the fruit of the tree of life: for we are told that man was driven out of Eden, 'lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever.'" But while it appears to have been designed to preserve his body, it seems also to have been a kind of pledge of that immortality which God held out to him as the splendid reward of continued holiness. To my mind, the following words of Richard Watson are, upon the whole, well based. "The tree of life was a kind of sacrament. As *the promise* of immortality was given to Adam, every time he ate of this tree by God's appointment, he expressed his faith in God's promise; and God, as often as he ate of it, sealed the promise of immortality to man. In this view, sin excluded man from the tree of life, as he lost his title to immortality." *Second*, you will also be led to understand the death threatened against disobedience; it was the opposite of living for ever, that is, ceasing for ever to exist, total extinction of being. This is the only natural meaning that the words "in the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die," will bear, and hence it receives from me an unhesitating reception. Unquestionably, the threatening of death was directed against the whole man, and not a part of him merely: as a being he was to die—to become extinct—just as he saw the inferior animals around him expire in death: and there is no reason to believe otherwise, than that all his ideas of dying were drawn from these spectacles occurring in the region where he was placed. "When Adam," says Jortin, "was told that if he offended he should *die*, he could not then understand by death a future punishment after death; but rather an annihilation of his soul, and a dissolution of his body, and a returning to the same insensibility from which he had been called into being." To interpret the words "thou shalt surely die," as equivalent to this, 'thy body shall return to the dust whence it was taken, and thy soul shall continue to live in endless agony,' appears to me, on mature reflection, exceedingly arbitrary and indefensible. 'Tis a question forced on my judgment, how could Adam understand continued and intensified existence to be signified by the word death, which expresses total cessation of existence? If death signifies life, then life may signify death; in a word, language might, on the same principle, mean anything, everything, or nothing, just as its user or expositor pleases. Tell me, does God speak in riddles to men? Does God choose language fitted only to mislead his creatures? What! do we not expect human laws and threatenings to be clearly expresed and easily understood; and how much more reasonable to expect, that those which issue from the throne of infinite intelligence and love, should possess these vital characteristics?

*Rufus.*—So that you would always interpret Scripture language literally, unless there is good reason to follow a different course?

*Persis.*—By all means. Assigning metaphorical and allegorical meanings to the plain terms of revelation has done immense damage to the souls of men and to the cause of God; it is high time such a pernicious system of interpretation were exploded for ever. Mr. Dobney gives the following canon of interpretation, and I believe it is valid and rational, —"That the literal sense is to be preferred in all cases in which it does not involve a contradiction of other parts of Scripture, or an absurdity, or any thing derogatory to the character of the Divine Being." Apply this rule to the words "thou shalt surely die," and the meaning will soon present itself to your mind. 'Thou shalt cease to be,' is obviously its simple and grammatical sense; and there can be no doubt that it was the merciful interposition of the mediatorial dispensation that shielded Adam from the execution of the sentence.

*Rufus.*—Truly, the idea of the complete extinction of his being is a melancholy thought; but it appears to me a much more natural meaning of the threatening than the one I have been accustomed to put upon it. Moreover, 'tis infinitely more like a Being whose name is "love," than to suppose, had mercy not prevented the infliction of the sentence, that he would have sent his erring child to interminable misery.

*Persis.*—The words of Theophilus of Antioch are striking, and, as they corroborate with the view involved, I shall read them—"But some one may say, Was not man created *mortal*? By no means! Immortal? Nor say we this. But my opinion is that he was neither mortal nor immortal by nature; for if he had been from the beginning immortal, he had made him a God. Again, on the other hand, if he had made him mortal, God would have seemed to be the author of his death. Therefore, he made him neither mortal nor immortal, as I said before, but capable of both, that he might *advance* to immortality, and by keeping the divine commandments receive immortality as a reward and become divine; but if, by disobedience to God he should turn to the works of the flesh, he would become unto himself the author of his own death."——

*Rufus.*—The nature of man's soul, being spiritual,

could not militate against the idea of its literal destruction or death?

*Persis.*—By no means; for though we are entirely ignorant of the essence of spirit, as we are, in fact, also of the essence of matter, it would be far wrong to imagine that God could not put it out of being. Whatever exists in the wide universe, has no claim for continued existence on its Creator beyond his pleasure: and it is a dictate of sound reason, that he can destroy as easily as he can summon into being. If he cannot destroy a grain of sand or an archangel, he is able to create neither. Had it not pleased him, in adorable compassion, to provide a Saviour for man, the second best thing which God could have done, and he always acts according to the dictates of infinite love, guided by infinite wisdom, was to consign him to the non-existence from which he had sprung. "His tender mercies are over *all* his works;" and, I doubt not, that saying will be illustrated by his deeds of judgment, as well as by those actions which are of a more pleasing character.

*Rufus.*—At this moment it occurs to me there is a verse in the 15th chapter of 1st Corinthians, to which you will permit me to request your attention. It is verse 32.—"If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the dead rise not? Let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die."

*Persis.*—Had I not given this passage a careful examination before now, I should have preferred making it the subject of remark on some future occasion; but as I am not unprepared to deliver my mind regarding it, you will please to consider a few remarks: "What advantageth it me," or what reward can I expect for preaching the gospel and suffering in the cause of Jesus, "if the dead rise not?" as some of the Corinthian church were maintaining (verse 12); "let us eat and drink," let us indulge in any kind of pleasure we choose, "for to-morrow we die:" that is, as I humbly suggest the words mean—all is done with us, we cease to exist in the universe of God, we are as if we had never been. This appears to me the natural meaning of the terms. They bring before us in a vivid manner the idea, that in Paul's estimation, no resurrection implied not merely no immortality, but no future existence for any extent or duration. In this verse, the word "die" is parallel with the term "perish," in verse 18.—"They also which have fallen asleep in Christ are perished;" that is, are now totally extinct. Even Dr. M'Knight, who was a minister of the Scotch Established Church, makes the honest acknowledgment that this exposition is at least as probable as the one which supposes the writer to assert that they had gone down to quenchless misery. He says, in paraphrasing verse 18,—"Certainly, also they who have suffered death for believing the resurrection of Christ, are perished; they have lost their existence here for a known falsehood, *and shall either have no existence*, or a miserable existence hereafter.

*Rufus.*—Might not the apostle mean this:—Since no resurrection would necessarily prove that Jesus had not risen, and that therefore there was no hope of salvation for Paul, he might live in sin as he pleased, since his final ruin was thus inevitable? This view, permit me to say, deserves consideration.

*Persis.*—Perhaps the wisest method is to try the two theories—extinction of being, and endless life in suffering—and see which of them harmonizes best with the words of Paul, considering him merely as a sincere, wise and upright man. On the supposition that he believed in the future literally everlasting misery of the unsaved, would he have used the expression thus—"Let us eat and drink (sin as we please), for to-morrow we die,"—earlier or later we must plunge into ceaseless woe. Considering the fact, with which he had every opportunity of being well acquainted, that there are degrees in the suffering, was it not of consequence for him to refrain from sin, so as, at least, to modify the coming judicial agony? His known sense and wisdom forbid the supposition that he could approve the maxim which he uttered. Was it consistent with the uprightness and benevolence of his heart, that he should, by uttering it, encourage others to become more guilty, and thereby to augment their own and his coming wretchedness? In his situation, even selfishness itself would have hindered him from following such a course of behaviour, as the one which he asserts it would be most natural to pursue were inevitable and eternal misery approaching. The second theory is, that Paul believed that if there was no resurrection, there would be no future state, and hence he said, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die,"—we shall in a little cease to exist. If he was certainly to become extinct, 'twas of no consequence how he lived; he knew the doom that was advancing, and in it his conduct could produce no change. This, to my mind, is the only theory which makes his language consistent; and therefore I understand him unequivocally to declare that, had there been no resurrection of the dead, his end, and the end of all human beings, was speedy, total, and everlasting cessation of being.

*Rufus.*—Then, assuredly, the apostle of the Gentiles did not believe in the natural or unconditional immortality of the human soul?

*Persis.*—He did not; and 'tis well, you will readily grant, for us to be of the same mind.

## LETTERS.

### "Pope Gregory."—From Dr. S. B. Barlow.

*New York*, Jan. 1851.

Geo. Storrs:—*Dear Sir*,—I take great delight in comparing ancient and modern opinions, doctrines, and practices, and often find the ancients in possession of truths which the modern popular churches discard almost without exception. I will just refer you to one instance. The modern churches, almost, if not quite universally, discard the doctrine of man's loss of his natural immortality by the first apostacy; whereas the early Catholic church certainly held that doctrine undisputed. Quere. Does the Romish church still hold that doctrine? and if not, when was it dropped? The good Pope Gregory, in certain instructions, and in resolving of certain doubts respecting doctrinal matters, addressed to the pious St. Augustine, the first Christian Bishop of the British nation, as early as A. D. 597, expressly affirms the doctrine in question, and I believe I may venture to assert, without fear of contradiction, that very few, if any, more learned, pious, and orthodox men than Gregory have ever ascended to St. Peter's chair. It is not uncommon to hear very pious and learned protestant clergymen speak in very high terms of commendation of Pope Gregory, as a most learned, sound, pious and orthodox Bishop. I wonder what they would say if they knew he held such a heresy as that man, since the fall, had no natural

immortality? The following are some of his words: "For when our first parents sinned in Paradise, they forfeited the immortality which they had received, by the just judgment of God. Because, therefore, Almighty God would not, for their fault, wholly destroy the human race, he both deprived man of immortality for his sin, and, at the same time, of his great goodness, reserved to him the power of propagating his race after him." See Bede's Ecclesiastical History, Book 1, chap. 27, A. D. 597.

Here the doctrine of man's loss of natural immortality is twice clearly affirmed, in only as many consecutive sentences, and I doubt not but some further search in other much neglected ancient works, may discover other plain assertions of the same doctrine. More perhaps, hereafter. In the meantime, wishing you all success in the setting forth of truth, I am your most obedient.

—

### From C. M. Richmond.

Bro. Richmond is a Baptist Minister, as some of our readers will recollect, who, more than a year ago, embraced the glorious truth of Immortality and Endless Life only in Christ. He then lived in Western New York, but since removed to Indiana. His letter is cheering. Let the Lord be praised.

*Peru, Ind., Jan. 24th*, 1851.

Br. Storrs:—The impression is sometimes found to exist, that, to labor successfully for the conversion of men, it is essential to teach the doctrine of the *endless misery* of the finally impenitent. Against this error I wish to bear decided testimony. During a revival last winter, several men were converted to God, who entertained no such notion as *unending torment*. And one of them, at least, was driven from *universalism*, by the truth that man has no immortality out of Christ, and then he found himself prepared to lay hold on eternal life. None of them at the time of their conversion, entertained the doctrine of universal salvation. No immortality out of Christ is, indeed, the *sword of the spirit*, before which Universalism must fall.

I have had the privilege, recently, of laboring in a precious revival, in which more than *thirty* were hopefully converted to God. The principal labour devolved on myself and a brother, who, with me, believes the wicked will be "*burned up.*" Of course we taught no *endless misery*. And the expressions *—immortal soul—deathless spirit—the soul that never dies, &c.*, were scarcely lisped by those who professed the common theory. And yet the work rolled on, and for three weeks, sinners were constantly inquiring what they should do to be saved. Twenty-five have been baptised. I wish to add, that *the difference* of my views, and those who hold to immortal soulism, was not made prominent, as under the circumstance, it would divert attention from the more important work.

—

### The Work Progresses.

The following is from a Baptist Minister, whose name we omit by his request, for the present:—

*Jan. 4th*, 1851.

Dear Bro. Storrs.—I am grateful for the Examiner sent me gratis by some unknown friend. The information it gives, from Europe and our own land, on the life and death question, has interested me much. Two years ago my attention was called to this subject, by your Six Sermons, and J. Foster's noted letter, and I have carefully examined it over since—have become convinced that the Bible and reason teaches the extinction of the wicked, after the judgment. I have not, as yet, decidedly preached my views, and am waiting till I can prepare a tract, giving the Bible on the subject, in a way I have not yet seen done. I take this course because I see no reason to change any other doctrine which I hold as a Baptist, and design to continue my standing in my denomination, or contend for it to the utmost. If labour is taken with me, it will elicit light, and I wish to be fully prepared to give it.

My plan for a tract is, to give the *number of times death, destruction, perish, &c.*, are used in the Bible, in relation to the final doom of the impenitent—quote a few from both testaments to show their meaning, and also quote texts from the Old Testament, to show the meaning of the terms and figures used in the New Testament, which seem to indicate eternal wo to the lost—give the number of texts which thus indicate continuance in wo—the number of times *life*, instead *happiness* is used, with reference to the final state of the righteous.

For instance, Jer. 7: 20, and several other texts, show that "*fire not quenched*" proves just the reverse of what is generally drawn from this phrase in the New Testament—and shows the object must become extinct.

I find about 160 places where *perish, death, &c.*, refer to the final doom of sinners; and over 200 where *life* is used as above stated.

I shall have but little time to devote to the subject for a month to come, and only give you an outline of my plan, hoping you can aid me by some suggestions as to such a tract. I should not draw off *all* the texts in which these terms are used, but may quote to them.

I think also of trying to show the reasonableness and beauty of God's plan, in permitting sin in the universe, as seen in *annihilating* all finally wretched beings—compared with either the plan of *eternal wo and sin*, to a part, or the plan of *saving all fallen races*, or all our race.

Rom. 9: 22—4; Eph. 1: 18; 2: 7; and 3: 10, suggest the subject I speak of.

I cannot be convinced of the sleep of the soul, or materialism, and fear that holding this up so prominently, in connection with the second death question, will greatly retard, if not entirely prevent, the establishment of the latter doctrine. Blotting from the universe, *sin and wo*, is a subject, compared with which, all the other peculiar subjects discussed by Advent Brethren, dwindle to a speck. Pursue Moncrieff's plan, if we wish to gain ground fast in this doctrine, is my view. It appears to me Dobney only intimates the sleep of the soul, for the purpose of obtaining stronger proof of his great doctrine; and that proof enough exists without it. The sleep of the soul *will* appear a gloomy doctrine to the mass of Christians. I can now only thus refer to my views. I can see, as yet, no necessary connection between the two doctrines, but perhaps you and others do. I am open to conviction and divine light—am much rejoiced by the light I have obtained.

I wish White's work, on "Life in Christ," could be reprinted in this country. I find some private brethren of talents, in my own and other churches, who hold Annihilation.

If you should refer to this in your Examiner, please omit my name. I shall not want for moral courage to proclaim my views when the proper time arrives, and if I cannot be employed in a Baptist church, then I shall travel and lecture, to do away, as much as possible, the gloom spread over the christian world, and the slander offered to our God, by the doctrine of eternal torment.

—

From P. Alling.

*Norwalk*, Ohio, Feb. 6, 1851.

Br. Storrs:—

I fully agree with you in the importance of the life and death question, especially at this time. It has truly come up at the right time, to save the little remnant of the elect from falling victims to the seducing spirits that are now rapidly spreading over the earth in their last great work of gathering or preparing the kings and inhabitants thereof, for the battle of the great day. It does look to me like God's own appointed means of safety; for let a person be fully established in the Bible truth, upon this subject, and he is at once armed and panoplied against their every attack: (that is, I mean so far as the rapping spirits are concerned.)

I have recently read the third and fourth chapters of Paul's Epistle to Timothy, with renewed interest, and from the light I now enjoy, am constrained to believe that amongst the multitudes (or heaps) of teachers that are "ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth," may be included the popular ministry, who teach the immortal theory, and sustain the foundation of that fable, together with every grade of spiritualizers and spiritualism, down to the rapping spirits, all of whom withstand the *truth* relative to the speedy coming and kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and kindred doctrines, as boldly as Jannes and Jambres (or the magicians) did Moses—"men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith." But thanks be to God, they will not be permitted to proceed much further; "for their folly shall be made manifest unto all men as theirs also was."—But O their end, their dreadful end! It makes me shudder to contemplate it. Their flocks of deceived ones, alas! alas! the deception will be discovered too late; their prayers will be unavailing after the master has risen up and shut the door. We must leave them in the hands of the Lord, who will do right, and make his righteous judgments manifest even in their destruction, to which my entire being responds, Amen!

I must dissent from your couclusions relative to the antichrist, or man of sin (2 Thess. 2,) being a personage, and yet to be developed. It is plain to my mind, that the mystery of iniquity began to work in St. Paul's day—continued to work during the existence of Imperial Rome, and was fully developed in Papal Rome, or when Papacy took her seat in the temple of God, &c.; and will remain there till destroyed by the brightness of Christ's personal coming.

—

Fallen Asleep.

*Portsmouth, Pa.*, January 29th, 1851.

*Brother Storrs*,—Our beloved brother, Rudolph Fisler, died on the 25th instant, of pleurisy, aged 57 years. He fell asleep in Jesus with the full assurance of soon being waked out of his sleep by the descent of his long absent Lord, with a shout, and the voice of the arch-angel and trump of God. His faith was, that immortality was to be sought for by faithful continuance in well-doing, and to be put on at the last trump. He bore his affliction with great patience. He was like a lamb in meekness; spoke of his death with much composure; was quite rational to the last. I delivered a discourse at his burial from Job 14: 14.—"If a man die, shall he live again?"

Yours,

N. Buckingham.

—

Books.—For a list of our Books, &c., see the Examiner for January and February. Especially we hope our friends will put forth a new effort to scatter the work of Dobney on Future Punishment. See notice of it in last Examiner. Some are doing well in orders for the *Abridged Edition*. Let it be scattered by thousands. *Price only* 25 *cents*.

—

The following is from an unknown person; but accompanied by substantial evidences of good will, viz: $2 inside the letter, and a gold dollar under the seal so closely hidden that it was purely by accident we discovered it, and not for two weeks after the letter was received. Not the less acceptable on that account. The donor will accept our thanks.—Editor.

For the Bible Examiner.

## BIBLE TRUTH.

Disburden'd of a theory false and vain—
Another atmosphere we seem to breath,
Nor is it fancy—but a joyful truth.
Immortal-soulism, with all its train,
Exchanged for Bible truth, hath passed away,
Like a vague dream, when reason is resumed.

Welcome—thrice welcome—cheering dawn of day,
Expelling darkness and the midnight gloom,
So long, so wide outspread o'er human hearts!
Thy rays unveil the sacred character
Of Him whose nature and whose name is Love!
Not a vindictive, but a gracious God.

Perfect in all his attributes, as seen
Held forth to view, in all his works and ways:
Infinite goodness, wisdom, power and love,
Lasting, Eternal and Unchangeable.
Alas! that vain philosophy should shroud
Divine arrangements in such mystery!
Expose to ridicule the sacred chart,
Left as our only guide to endless life!
Proclaim aloud, ye heralds of the truth,
Heaven's fixed purposes and firm decree
Is endless life, through Christ alone obtained;
And all the wicked must forever die.

Fearless, go on, wherever truth shall lead;
Expose the fables palm'd on men for truth;
Blind leaders of the blind, e'er long may feel,
Reflect, resolve, investigate, and see
Unbroken beauties in the sacred chain,
As link'd together by unerring hands,—
Renounce their dogmas, and defend the truth.
Your heart responds—so be it Lord.—Amen.

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

**VOL. VI.** **PHILADELPHIA, APRIL, 1851.** **No. 4.**

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,

AT 198 MARSHALL STREET, THIRD DOOR ABOVE BROWN.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, one dollar; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; ALWAYS IN ADVANCE.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.


## THE TRUE SOURCE OF IMMORTALITY.

BY THOMAS READ, NEW YORK.

(Concluded from page 37.)

OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED.

Having incontrovertibly established the positions taken: first, *That man is* NOT *naturally immortal;* and secondly, *That immortality is a gift obtained through Jesus Christ, and bestowed upon man at the* RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD: and having brought forth a mass of clear scripture testimony, intended by the several writers to teach these very propositions: Therefore the pious Christian may plant his feet upon the immutable basis of God's holy word, as upon a rock of unyieldiug and everlasting adamant, knowing that the testimony of God standeth sure. Remember, too, that the testimony runs through various lines of argument; and many of the texts are directly to the point, plain, and positive; and that no sophistry can possibly twist many of them into an accordance with the opposing theory; and that they cannot be overthrown without invalidating the whole truth of God. And, seeing that there is no scripture that asserts that man, or the soul of man is naturally immortal, and that no text asserts that immortality is obtained in any other way than through the redemption there is in Christ Jesus: and that this blessed hope, "to wit, the redemption of our body," will not be accomplished until the resurrection of the dead: therefore, every inference that would *appear* to contradict the positions laid down, must necessarily be incorrectly drawn, and the truth of the positions taken might safely rest without any reply to any objections that might be raised. But, as some well disposed Christians might suppose that some of these objections have weight, they will be slightly examined.

The candid reader will remember that it is not necessary, for the sake of more firmly establishing the Bible view of immortality, to give the correct interpretation to the texts upon which objections are made, but merely to give such a plausible interpretation, as will make them perfectly agree with the other parts of God's word, and to show that, in their literal import, they do not contradict the positions here laid down, nor sustain the inferences that have been drawn from them. But it is thought that the interpretations given to most of them will commend themselves to the understanding of the reader.

That the reader may see the passages of scripture that have been most relied upon by the advocates of *inherent* immortality, and consequently opposed to *immortality as the gift of God in Christ Jesus, entered into by a resurrection from the dead,* the principal passages are placed altogether before him.

1. Phil. 1: 21—23. For me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ, which is far better.

2. Matt. 22: 32. I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.

3. Luke 23: 43. To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.

4. Gen. 2: 7. And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.

5. Luke 23: 46. Father into thy hands I commend my spirit.

6. Acts 7: 59. Lord Jesus receive my spirit.

7. Rev. 6: 9. I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God and the testimony which they held: and they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell upon the earth? And white robes were given unto every one of them; and it was said unto them, wait yet a little longer.

8. Rev. 20: 4. I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, &c., . . . . and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years.

An angel that communicated with John, said,

9. Rev. 19: 10. I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren that have the testimony of Jesus.

10. Rev. 22: 9. I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them that keep the sayings of this book.

11. John 11: 26. Whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die.

12. 2 Cor. 12: 3. Whether in the body or out of the body I cannot tell.

13. The Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus.

14. The Transfiguration.

15. Luke 2: 29. Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word.

16. Eccl. 3: 21. Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward.

17. Eccl. 12: 7. Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it.

18. Gen. 3: 4. And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die.

None of these texts are intended to teach us that dead men are alive; or that an essential part of them, the soul, is alive. None of them teach us that the soul is naturally immortal. None of them teach us that when a man dies his soul exists in a conscious state, and either enjoys the glories of heaven and is with Christ, or suffers the pains of hell. None of them teach that the soul is judged separately from the body. And none of them teach us that the soul is a separate entity or person from the body, and can live when separated from it.

Even the speech of the serpent, plain and pointed as it is, does not intimate, that though the body died, the soul should not die: but is in direct opposition to the word of God, In the day that thou eatest thereof, dying, thou shalt die. The soul that sinneth, it shall die. We insist that the serpent meant, that man's bodily organization should not die, should not be decomposed; but in this he lied.

He could have no idea, from the analogy of his own nature, or the nature of any other created being, that the living soul was different from and independent of the living man. The truth remains uncontradicted, that "the dead know not anything;" and that "there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in sheol," the state of the dead.

THE EXPOSITION OF SUPPOSED CONFLICTING TEXTS.

1. Phil. 1: 20—23. In the 23d verse there is no word corresponding to depart, in the original; the figure used implies the returning of Christ to the port. It has been translated thus: For I have an earnest desire for the returning and being with Christ, which is far better. Then the whole passage will bear this brief paraphrase.

Paul says, these hardships and imprisonment have happened to me for the *furtherance of the gospel;* for Christ shall be *magnified in my body*, whether by *life* or *death*. For me to *live, is to magnify Christ*, and *to die is gain to the cause of Christ;* if I live, I shall be serviceable to the Philippian converts; but if I die for the truth, it will more effectually subserve the gospel of Christ. I am willing at any time to abandon my toils and sufferings, to die for Christ, as I earnestly desire to be with Christ, and as death is but the hiding myself as it were for a little moment; (Isa. 26: 20) the next moment of conscious existence, I shall awake to the glorious appearing of Christ in the clouds of heaven, and receive from his hands my crown of everlasting rejoicing. So I labor, regardless of suffering or death, that I may win Christ; if by any means I may *attain unto the resurrection from out the dead*.

2. Matt. 22: 32. I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. God is not the God of the dead but of the living.

The only question discussed between Christ and the Sadducees, was the *resurrection*. The Sadducees could not have been put to silence, if they could have interpreted Christ's words as referring only to an intermediate state. Christ argues that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob must *be raised again*, or God, who called himself their God, would be the God of the dead; Christ proves that they live to God only by the promised resurrection. See Rom. 4: 17, and Heb. 11: 16.

3. Luke 23: 42. He said unto Jesus, Lord remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom. And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, to-day shalt thou be with me in paradise.

If Christ gave a direct answer to the question of the penitent thief, then that answer refers to the period, when Christ should establish his kingdom on the earth, and sit upon the throne of his father David and restore paradise, or the third heaven on this earth. The first heavens and earth were destroyed by the flood; the second heavens and earth are reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men; and the third heavens, or paradise, will be the new heavens and new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness and where the everlasting kingdom of Christ will be established. The text will admit of this interpretation, by changing the position of the comma, which is no part of inspiration, and which indeed has been done by celebrated critics, without reference to this question. But before any reference can be correctly drawn from this text it must be made to harmonize with the 32d v. Mat. 27: 44; Mark 15: 28, 32; with John's silence, with Isa. 53: 9, 12; Prov. 1: 24–30 and Rom. 2: 6, 7.

And after reconciling these, before it can be made to sustain any reference touching an intermediate state of consciousness, it must first be proved that the thief was actually dead before sunset, or 14 minutes past 6, as that day then ended. I think that it cannot be satisfactorily proved that his legs were broken, which of itself is not sufficient to cause immediate death, till the lighting up of the Sabbath candles about half past 6. It would be dark on the 3rd of April A. D. 29 in lat. 31° 50′ at 20 minutes past 7. Then again, his going immediately to paradise, (which has no present existence,) cannot possibly be reconciled with John 20: 17, "Touch me not, for I have not yet ascended to my father," "As Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." "Thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin." "He hath poured out his soul unto death." "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hades," the state of the dead. "That his soul was not left in hades," and "Christ died, and rose again according to the scriptures." Indeed the authenticity of this text is very doubtful.

4. Gen. 2: 7. Has been already thoroughly examined.

5 and 6. Father, into thy hands I commend my *life*, and having said this he breathed it out. That is, he expired.

7 and 8. Rev. 6: 9 and 20: 4. John, while he was in the Spirit, had a highly symbolical representation made to him of "things which must be *hereafter*." John saw the souls *under* the altar, the very place where the souls, lives, or blood of the martyrs would be poured out. If Abel's blood found a voice, and Jesus' blood finds a voice, does it surprise you that in this symbolical book, the souls, or blood of the saints that were not then born, should find a voice? This voice is to encourage the living advocate for truth to persevere unto death, yea, in spite of it.

9 and 10. These fellow servants might be Enoch and Elijah.

11. John 11: 28. Whosoever liveth, and believeth in me, shall never die.

This text, read with the context, can mean no more than that they shall have immortality. And the reverse is necessarily implied; Whosoever liveth and believeth *not* in me, *shall die*, or shall not live for ever. So this text instead of supporting the idea of a conscious intermediate state, proves the doctrine contended for in these pages, that man is mortal,

and can obtain immortality ONLY through faith in Christ Jesus.

12. 2 Cor. 12: 2, 3. By paradise, Paul means the new heavens and new earth. The first and second heavens and earth will then have been destroyed by water and fire, and the next will be the third heavens. And whether the imagery of paradise was presented to his mind; or whether he was bodily carried away, Paul knew not. If his soul had truly left the body, he would have been dead, and could not have written these words without a resurrection.

13. THE PARABLE OF THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS.—Luke 16: 19. This is a parable. We find it in the midst of other parables. The first seven words are exactly like the first seven words of the preceding parable. Then if this be interpreted literally, so must that; but then we shall have injustice commended by Christ. Who will then dare to interpret it literally? A literal interpretation would prove Professor Bush's theory, that the resurrection has passed already, and likewise the doctrine of purgatory. Understood literally, it cuts up the doctrine of "the immateriality of the soul," root and branch, for here all is material. Lazarus was carried bodily to Abraham's bosom. Here, too, we have fingers, and eyes, and tongues. We have too an impassable gulf preventing the egress of the rich man to the future judgment seat of Christ. Before Lazarus could convey the wished-for information to the earth, he must rise from the dead.

Whitby finds this very parable in the Gamara Babylonicum. We can allow this parable to teach us the folly of choosing the pleasures of this life as our only portion; the danger of riches; and likewise that, if the word of the living God is not sufficient for our conversion, neither should we be persuaded, though one rose from the dead. But we cannot allow it to teach us that dead men are alive; when the bible elsewhere clearly teaches us that "the dead know not anything."

THE TRANSFIGURATION.

14. Mat. 17. This was a vision. V. 9. Jesus charged them, saying, Tell the vision to no man, until the Son of man be risen again from the dead. But what has this to do with the immortality of the soul, or its immateriality. Elijah did not die, and both appeared personally; and if it were not a vision, Moses must have been raised from the dead.

15. Luke 2: 29. "Lord now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word." God had fulfilled his promise, and Simeon was now fully resigned to death. The words do not import that he desired death for its own sake.

16. Ecc. 3: 21. "Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth?" Solomon had just said there was no difference in death between man and beasts; but while living, the spirit or mind of one ranges over the heavens, weighs the planets, and counts the stars: while the spirit of the other is wholly engrossed in earthly things. The Septuagint translates it: Who knoweth if the spirit of man goeth upward?

17. Ecc. 12: 7. "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." It may mean, breathed into the expanse of heaven. But the meaning will be best perceived by comparing it with the other texts.

Job 34: 14. If God set his heart upon man, if he gather unto himself his spirit and his breath; all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust.

Ps. 104: 29. Thou takest away their breath, they die, and return to their dust.

Ps. 146: 4. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish.

18. Gen. 3: 4. And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die.

We confess that if this text is to be received as gospel; it would indeed prove the immortality of man; but not the immortality of the soul, nor an intermediate state. But who wishes the devil to teach him theology? As he is our adversary, it is at least a suspicious circumstance, when he attempts it. May all christians abhor the teaching of the father of lies.

THE NEW DOCTRINE.

It is objected against the views advocated in these pages that they are *new*. This we deny. They were always the common heritage of the Saints till the church became corrupted by popery about 150 years after Christ. And finally about A. D. 290, their place was usurped by the introduction of the doctrine of Plato, and the profitable doctrine of purgatory. In A. D. 1520 Martin Luther places the doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul, among the monstrous opinions to be found in "the Roman dunghill of decretals."

To make this matter clear, we give one quotation from *Irenæus*, the disciple of Polycarp, who was the scholar of the Apostle John. He thus writes:

"Life is not from ourselves, nor from our nature, but it is given or bestowed according to the grace of God; and therefore he who preserves this gift of life, and returns thanks to him who bestows it, he shall receive '*length of days for ever and ever.*' But he who rejects it, and proves unthankful to his Maker for creating him, and will not know him who bestows it, *he deprives himself of the gift of duration to all eternity.* And therefore the Lord speaks thus of such unthankful persons: 'If you have not been faithful in that which is least, who will commit much to you?' intimating thereby unto us, that they who are unthankful to him with respect to this short, transitory life, which is his gift, the effect of his bounty, *shall be most justly deprived of length of days in the world to come.*"

Thus is it every way proved, that Immortality only in Christ Jesus, was the doctrine once delivered to the Saints. And that it is not a new doctrine, but that it can easily be traced back to the writings of Moses.

I have examined all the principal texts, and all the evidences within my reach, that are usually relied upon to prove the stupendous doctrines of the independent conscious existence of the soul, and its natural immortality. And so little to the point are some of the texts and arguments usually brought forward, and so readily answered are all, that if, after a careful reading of these pages, any will still cling to them for the purpose of supporting those Christ-dishonoring doctrines we are endeavoring to root out, unless they can answer the arguments herein brought forward, we cannot help considering it as presumptive evidence, that they are not seeking to grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ.

May God bless us all with the knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus, that the truth may make us

free; and bestow upon us all, the precious boon of immortality, through his Son Jesus Christ by a resurrection from the dead.

## LIFE IN CHRIST.

By Edward White, England.

(Continued from page 40.)

It is quite evident to us, and will probably become equally evident to any mind, which devotes but a moment to the attempt to realize the meaning of the phrase "everlasting misery,"--(a phrase which may indeed convey but little to a person armed with a theological determination *not to think* of it, but which confounds, rather than overwhelms the meditative spirit,)—that such an interpretation of the simple term death, ought not, as it generally is, to be taken for granted. And the allegation of the New Testament authority for it is of little avail;—for those terms and passages of the New Testament which are supposed to fix the metaphorical signification of the original curse, have been themselves first interpreted by the rule of a theory founded alone upon these earliest statements of Scripture—a theory based on the strongly disputed assumption of the immortality of the soul. And if neither reason nor Scripture permit us to entertain that exalted conception of human dignity, the whole fabric of interpretations, reared afterwards upon it, must fall to the ground.

With a view to a settlement of our minds, upon this important fundamental, let us more particularly observe, in reference to the ordinary belief, that the death threatened to Adam included the curse of everlasting existence in misery for his soul:—

I. First, that Moses says not one word on the subject. It is true that much caution is needful in the use of any argument drawn from the silence of an Old Testament writer, and especially in the earlier portions of the Divine revelation. It may fairly be urged, that the second and third chapters of Genesis were the brief statements of "mysteries," which all succeeding revelations were given to develop; and that, therefore the greater regard is due to the inspired commentary of subsequent prophets. Yet, on the other hand, we cannot but observe that the chief outlines of the Paradisiacal history are received by the best divines in their plain, unvarnished sense;* which circumstance is a strong preliminary argument in favor of so understanding all its parts, and in bar of suggested human additions, whether of poetry or prose, wherever the literal sense is not forbidden by following declarations of Scripture, and does not contradict the general doctrine of redemption. There is, besides, a great difference between a veiled promise and a veiled threatening. The former may be worthy of Divine justice. The blessing of Christ in the Gospel, might fitly be promised under the figurative expression, that "the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head;" but the curse of the law, which called for the intervention of redeeming mercy, should surely be expressed in all the length and breadth of its terribleness. Can any good and feeling heart, (and let us remember that the Maker of good and feeling hearts has "much more" feeling himself; Matt. vii. 11,) suppose, that in the original threatening, a term would be employed which must primarily suggest the idea of an infliction, in its literal sense already sufficiently tremendous—"Thou shalt die;"—and yet, that behind that screen there was concealed a deeper meaning, compared with which, even the doom of losing an eternal existence in the image of God, was absolutely as nothing? Is it credible that He who best knew, and indeed who alone knew, what an eternity of misery involved, and who in after ages sent his prophets to mourn, without any limit to their loud lamentations, over the mere temporal calamities of his people, (see Asaph and Jeremiah,) would, in this first fixing of the conditions of human probation, have failed to denote as clearly the positive infliction of suffering intended, as the privation which transgression required? And again, when the curse had been actually incurred, is it to be believed, that the most perfect silence would be preserved by the Judge on that part of it, which was essentially the curse, after all, and that the whole stress of the divine attention would be directed to that *bodily decease* which was, when compared with the impending fate of the spirit, but as a grain of sand to the universe, or one point of space to infinity? Gen. iii. 9—19.

II. In addition to the foregoing weighty consideration, the view which it has been demonstrated that Divine revelation takes of *the nature of man* is opposed to the interpretation before us. It has been pointed out that, according to the uniform representations of the Bible, man is essentially a compound being, consisting of body and soul, presenting his characteristic "image" in the flesh, and not in the spirit. It is this compound nature which the latter dispensations of Heaven regard, and which, therefore, we may fairly presume, the primæval dispensation of law must have regarded as well. It follows from this principle, that if death, threatened to the *man*, involved the conception of everlasting existence in misery, that menace *could not* have contemplated the spirit alone; for the spirit of man is not MAN. If the holy Ruler of Heaven had intended an endless infliction of suffering upon the man, the curse must, according to this view, have necessarily demanded the associated body to share in the torment. The body would not have been permitted to die a literal death. We are borne out in this declaration by the remarkable fact that when it is intended, in consequence of the abuse of a new system of probation, to punish the wicked of mankind, it is announced that Divine power will raise the bodies of the "unjust" from the grave to undergo the infliction. But since it is admitted by the writers in question, that the *original curse* contemplated no such eternal infliction of pain upon the body of Adam, but simply the literal dissolution of its frame, we argue that, therefore, it is an unwarrantable imagination that the spirit alone was destined to endure an immortality of suffering; for why should the curse of the law take an immortal effect upon one-half of his nature, when both the promise and the curse of the gospel, or new system of merciful trial for recovery, are directed to the whole of it?

III. Another argument, slightly differing from the last, and apparently fatal to the common hypothesis, arises from the consideration, that the threatening of death ought, in consistency, to be taken either literally or figuratively in relation to the complex whole of the constitution of Adam. For if, as it is alleged, "the most opposite thing to the life of his soul was perfect, perpetual, hopeless mis-

* See Mr. Holden's calm and convictive defence of the orthodox view of the literal sense of the fall.

ery,"* because "life signifies happiness," then, in all reason, the most opposite thing to the "happiness or life" of his body, was everlasting torture in hell. But if this is admitted not to have been contemplated in the original threatening, we seem to be warranted in supposing, that since God, who could have immortalised his body for torment, did not do so, but intended its death, He likewise intended a literal and final dissolution of the whole compound nature, as the subject of judgment: for if literal destruction was the most opposite thing to the life of the body, as the history proves, literal dissolution, without any further infliction, was the most opposite thing to the life of the entire humanity. We cautiously abstain from insisting on an absolute *destruction of the spirit*, as necessarily conveyed in the threatening of "death;" for, according to the preceding view, that curse was fulfilled in the separation of body and soul. But the curse left it open for God to preserve the spirit alive after death, if he so pleased, since the letter of the law required nothing further than the "killing" of the man (2 Cor. iii.); and this circumstance *was* taken advantage of afterwards, when God actually did uphold the separate spirit in existence, in consequence of the intervention of the system of mercy. We contend, therefore, that the sentence of the law, not contemplating in itself a resurrection of the man, does not *in its spirit* contemplate a survivance of the soul but its passing away into the land of forgetfulness, as not being itself singly and alone a subject of jurisdiction to that authority which regarded only the compound humanity. The curse which threatened death *to the man*, did not threaten afterwards an everlasting survivance in torment to one part of his being.

Undoubtedly, this is an admission, that the curse of the law would have been executed, even if the spirit had survived its infliction; but this is a very different thing from asserting, as do the writers in question, that the curse of the law *required* such a survivance, and an eternal survivance in misery.—For as it was open to the Supreme Ruler on the one hand, consistently with the letter of the law, to uphold the departed spirit in being, it was according to our representation, open to him, on the other hand, consistently with the spirit of the law, which demanded a final dissolution of man's nature for ever—to deprive it of being; the actual event of the soul's survivance at death, not depending upon the curse of the law, but upon the intention of God as to the introduction or withholding of a system of redemption. The doctrine of Scripture, then, requires us, in brief, to conclude, that the dissolution of the *man* was the whole curse of the law; and that therefore the spirit of that curse did not contemplate, as it certainly did not demand, an eternal and miserable survivance of the soul; while yet, notwithstanding, the absence of any explicit demand for its literal destruction, admitted of its survivance in Hades, in order to render a resurrection of the man possible, under a scheme of rewards and penalties, arising from a merciful plan of redemption. And when, at the termination of such a second probation, the curse takes a second and aggravated effect on the sinner, the absence of any intention in God to grant a resurrection of the condemned from the second death, may render it conformable to his wisdom and justice "*to destroy both soul and body in hell.*"

IV. The most decisive evidence however, that literal death, a loss of immortal life for the compound man, and without any further infliction upon the soul alone, was the curse of the law, occurs in the argument of the Apostle, in the fifth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. In that place, summing up the whole of his previous reasonings on the law, he thus concludes, in verses 12—14:—"Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and DEATH by sin, and so DEATH passed upon all men, for that all have sinned. (For before the law, sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed where there is no law. Nevertheless, DEATH reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that is to come.") In the verses included in a parenthesis, viz. 13 and 14, it is obviously the apostle's object to show that the statement in the preceding sentence, verse 12, was correct; to wit, that death entered into the world by the offence of one man;—that by the offence of that one man, all had been constituted sinners, (as he afterwards expresses it,) and rendered liable to death. He therefore desires to prove that it was not the entrance of the Mosaic law which brought death, the penalty of sin, into the world for the first time; since, says he, during the period which elapsed before the giving of the law, from Adam to Moses, men died:—yes, and even those that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression; by which it is to be apprehended, notwithstanding the objections of some eminent critics, he means infants and young children; for sin, he adds, is not imputed where there is no law. Yet here sin was imputed as is evident from the penalty endured; therefore there must have been some law reigning from Adam to Moses,—a law which consigned personally sinless beings to death, through the imputation of the guilt of their great ancestor.

Now, our argument is as follows:—In the fourteenth verse, when he declares that *death* reigned from Adam to Moses over the personally innocent, it surely must be admitted that he intends no other death than that which we have described as the one always referred to in Scripture; a dissolution of the compound humanity, without any reference to a future eternal state of suffering for the soul.—Else, we shall find ourselves called upon to receive the astounding and abominable sentiment, that the souls of infants, children, idiots, &c., from Adam to Moses, went to a state of everlasting suffering after their natural death; and that, as is specially pointed out, for no fault of their own. But if this be an intolerable interpretation, repugnant alike to the whole temper of reason and revelation, and to the character of God, it follows, by all the rules of clear writing, that the term *death* stands for exactly the same idea in the twelfth verse, which introduces the argument. It is inconceivable that the apostle has changed the signification of the same word in the distance between two verses; for if that be the case here, we might on the same principle conclude that when he uses the term faith repeatedly in the course of his reasonings, he as repeatedly changes the meaning of the word, and thus introduces inextricable confusion into the language of the Scripture.* If this observation be admitted as just (and

* See "What was the Fall?"—the quotation from Edwards, in p. 7.

* If the terms "loss of health" were substituted for

it must be a strange theology which requires the abandonment of this principle of interpretation, in a passage where no variation in the sense of the term is indicated by any of the usual marks of emphasis, or allusion, or explanation) then it inevitably follows, that the *death* which Adam brought into the world, as the wages of sin, was *not* an immortality of the soul, in misery, after natural dissolution; but that literal dissolution (of the compound nature of body and soul) itself;—a definition which will embrace the cases both of Adam and of his sinless infantile posterity.

From these considerations, then, we cannot but determine that the original threatening, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," was intended to signify a literal, an immediate, a final dissolution of the nature of Adam as a man; his death, in the literal and ordinary sense of the word, without any reference whatever to the state, or even to the survivance of the spirit beyond.*—Adam was placed in Paradise, a wonderful combination of earth and spirit; allied to the animals and to the angels; on probation, to "see what was in his heart;" whether by obedience and faith he would aspire to rise to the rank of immortals, and "never die;" or whether by disobedience and unbelief, he would forfeit, for himself and his posterity, the possession of that blessed prospect of eternal glory which was visible from the heights of his almost celestial abode in the garden of Eden. This *death* was the curse of the law; not merely of the Mosaic law, but of that everlasting law under which Adam was created at first, aud of which the thunders of Sinai were only a manifestation. In the language of Paul, "The letter *killeth*." 2 Cor. iii. 6.

(To be Continued.)

Our beloved brother, CHARLES FITCH, of whom we spoke, last July, in our history of the "*Progress*" of the views of immortality we entertain, "*though dead yet speaketh.*" We have determined to place in the Examiner two articles he wrote shortly after he took his "stand" by our "side." The following is the first.

## THE END OF THE WICKED.

What is the end of the wicked?

Phil. 3. 19.—"For many walk of whom I have told you often and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ; whose END is *destruction.*"

What does destruction mean?

2 Thess. 1: 7—"And to you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, with his mighty angels in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting *destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power.*"

Where is the presence of the Lord? and where the glory of His power?

Psalms 139: 7.—"Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold thou art there; if I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me." Then God's presence is in heaven, hell and sea. If, then, the wicked are destroyed *from God's presence*, they must have an everlasting destruction from heaven, hell and sea.

Col. 1: 16.—"For by Him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities or powers; all things were created by Him and for Him, and He is before all things, and by Him all things consist." Now the glory of God's power must be wherever His works are; hence to to be destroyed from the glory of God's power, the wicked must be destroyed from all things in heaven, and from all things in earth, from all things visible, from all things invisible, from thrones, from dominions, from principalities and powers, from all things which by Him consist. When thus destroyed, the wicked must be destroyed out of the universe, and then as we are taught in the 20th chapter of Job; "They which have seen Him shall say, where is he?" And what answer does the Bible give?

Psalms 37: 10.—"For yet a little while and the wicked shall not be, yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place and it shall not be." Prov. 10: 25; "As the whirlwind passeth, so is the wicked no more."

But are there not some passages of Scripture which prove that though the *wicked* are to be destroyed as we are taught above, they will yet continue to exist!

I know of no passages which can be quoted for such a purpose but the following:

Matt. 25: 46.—"And these shall go away into everlasting punishment." Dan. 12: 2—"And some to shame and everlasting contempt." Rev. 14: 11.—"And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever, and they have no rest day nor night." Rev. 19: 3.—"And her smoke rose up for ever and ever." Rev. 20: 10.—"And shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever."—Mark 9: 45, 46.—"To be cast into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched, where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched."

If any passages in the Bible can be brought to prove the endless existence of the wicked it must be these. But what will be the effect of the unquenchable fire upon the wicked? Rev. 21: 3.—"The fearful and unbelieving, and abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death." What will be the effect?—Matt. 3: 12.—"He will thoroughly purge His floor and gather His wheat into the garner, but He will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." Mal. 4: 1.—"For behold the day cometh that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly shall be stubble; and the day that cometh

*death* throughout the passage, we should be surprised to learn that those terms were intended to convey their plain and obvious meaning in verse 14; but that in verse 12 they signified a loss of reputation and property, and the transmission of blindness to all his descendants.—Yet this alteration of meaning would be as nothing compared with that supposed in two reputed senses of "death;" dissolution and interminable suffering in hell.

* In this sense the *same words* are used by the Almighty in threatening Abimelech. Gen. xx. 7.

shall burn them up, saith the Lord, that it shall leave them *neither root nor branch*." Where will the wicked be when they are burned up root and branch with unquenchable fire? God answers the question in Prov. 12: 7.—"The wicked are overthrown and are not."

But, "their worm dieth not," and what does that prove? Isa. 51: 8.—"For the moth shall eat them up like a garment, and the worm shall eat them like wool."

Then, if their worm dieth not, and their fire is not quenched, we may expect to say of them as in Ps. 73: 19.—"They are *utterly consumed* with terrors." What terrors? The worm that never dies, the fire that never shall be quenched.

Now do the terms everlasting and forever and ever applied to the punishment of the wicked prove that they will forever exist? If these terms always express endless duration, then they do when applied to the wicked; but if, in some instances, they are used to express a limited duration, they may express a limited duration when applied to the wicked; and hence will not prove that the wicked forever exist.

Are there instances then in which these words are used to express limited duration?

Hab. 3: 6; "The everlasting mountains were scattered." Mich. 1: 4; "And the mountains shall be molten under him." Then the everlasting mountains will have an end. Numbers 25: 13; "And he shall have it and his seed after him, the covenant of an everlasting priesthood." That priesthood long since ended. Hence everlasting does not always express endless duration." Jude 7; "Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities about them are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of *eternal fire*." That eternal fire certainly went out when those cities ceased to burn. Hence, eternal does not always express endless duration. It is said in Isa. 34: 9, 10; respecting the land of Idumea, which is Edom, "The streams thereof shall be turned into pitch, and the dust thereof into brimstone, and the land thereof shall become burning pitch; it shall not be quenched *night nor day*, the smoke thereof shall go up forever: from generation to generation shall it lie waste, none shall pass through it forever and ever." Now in any view which can be taken of the land of Idumea, its flames after all will cease to burn, and its smoke cease to ascend; for though this is doubtless to be at the final conflagration of the world, even the world will cease to burn, for God has promised to make of it a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. These terms therefore do not always imply endless duration, and hence, may not when applied to the wicked. I am, therefore, left to the necessity of looking to other portions of the Bible, for the purpose of ascertaining what evidence there is that the wicked will have immortality; and I cannot find a shadow of evidence from any part of God's word. I am told in the Ps. 37: 20, that "the wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs; they shall consume; into smoke shall consume away." In the 38th verse I read; "But the transgressors shall be destroyed together; the end of the wicked shall be cut off."

In Ps. 92: 7, I read, "When the wicked spring as the grass, and when all the workers of iniquity do flourish, it is that they shall be destroyed forever;" and now when told that their "end is destruction," that they shall be "utterly consumed with terrors," and that "yet a little while and they shall not be," that "the day that cometh shall burn them up, root and branch," how can we believe God, while we suppose that the wicked are to have an endless existence. To suppose this, is to believe what Satan told our first parents, "ye shall not surely die."

Adam was made a living soul, but he lost life when he sinned. 2 Tim. 1; 16, Christ has abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel. And now, John 3: 36, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life—but he that believeth not on the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." Those, therefore, "who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory, honor and immortality," are promised "eternal life." See Rom. 2: 7. But Rom. 6: 23, "The wages of sin is death; the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord." To say now, that the wages of sin is an endless existence, instead of death, and those who reject Christ live to all eternity, is it to believe the old serpent instead of God. It may be said that the death of the wicked means endless suffering, but this is to confound language. Suffering, however severe, is not death. It is said that man has an immortal soul; this is to belie the Bible, because immortality is promised to those only who seek it through Christ; and besides, God says, the 'SOUL that sinneth, it shall die,' and Christ says, that God "is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Christ only hath immortality: 1 Tim. 6: 16.

From these scriptures, and others, I am satisfied that to promise the wicked anything but utter destruction, is to say, "ye shall not surely die;" and is infidelity, as truly as to say that the righteous "shall not have eternal life through Christ." It is believed, I know, that men live after they are dead, and know more, unspeakably, than when they are alive, but the Bible says, "the dead know not anything," "his breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth, in that very day his thoughts perish." Eccl. 9: 5. Ps. 146: 4.

It is strange indeed what liberties men have learned to take with the word of God. In the statute books of our country, there will be found a law against murder, the penalty of which is death. What would be thought of the man who should maintain that death in this case, meant a system of interminable torture in a dungeon. When God, therefore, says, "the soul that sinneth, it shall die," and "the wages of sin is death," where has He authorized us to say, that by death, He means a system of interminable torture in the dungeons of hell. The wicked are to "have their part in a lake, that burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death." They are to be devoured, 'utterly consumed,' "burned up root and branch," they are "overthrown and are not," and "as the whirlwind passeth so is the wicked no more."

Let him who dares disbelieve God on this subject, do it. For myself I have believed the declaration of the old serpent, "ye shall not surely die," long enough.

It may be asked, are not the dead spoken of as though living, in the Bible? Certainly. But the Bible explains itself on that subject, when it tells us that "God quickeneth the dead and calleth those things which be not as though they were." See Rom. 4: 17. Of this there are repeated instances in the Bible. God spoke of Abraham, Isaac and

Jacob as though alive, because they were to be raised; so Christ taught the Sadducees in the 20th chap. of Luke. So of Israel in the valley of dry bones, in the 37th chap. of Ezek. So of the rich man and Lazarus. So of the Saints in the Revelations, crying out for vengeance, as did the blood of Abel from the ground. Though they were not; God called them as though they were.

Our Saviour's promise to the thief may be thought another difficulty. But the prayer of the penitent was this: "Lord remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom." Our Lord replied, "Verily I say unto thee, this day; with me thou shalt be in Paradise." I give it precisely as it reads in the original Greek. It was, therefore, an assurance to the dying thief, that when our Lord came into the kingdom, he should be remembered, according to his prayer; and proves nothing against the plain scriptural declaration that "the dead know not anything." CHARLES FITCH.

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

## PHILADELPHIA, APRIL, 1851.

"THE SPIRIT MESSENGER," like all other *ghosts*, seems to dread *the light*. It will neither come near our office nor suffer the Bible Examiner to live in its dark abode. We sent the Examiner regularly to the Messenger; but we have been informed that our paper was committed to the flames by the *ghost worshippers;* that its fate was "to be burned." Very well: "he that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved." We convicted the "Spirit Messenger" of blaspheming against the revelation of God; and showed, out of its own mouth, that it was a "Messenger" of Satan. No wonder that it should seek revenge by burning the Examiner; and we doubt not the same spirit would burn the Editor of the Examiner, if it had the power. That it seeks such power we do not question, notwithstanding all its hypocritical professions of "*love.*" We know the "knocking spirits" well; and, by the help of the grace of God, we intend they shall know that those who blaspheme Christ and his truth, shall not go unrebuked while we have a pen to write, and a *medium* through which to warn our fellow-men that these spirits, wherever located, "are of the Synagogue of Satan."

---

"THE SOUL AND BODY.—That there is a soul within the body, who can doubt? The eye sees but it cannot remember what has been seen, and the ear hears; *but* it cannot remember what has been heard. Memory belongs to some other power distinct from the eye and the ear.

"We look upon the bright face of the heavens, and the rich scenery of the earth, and we are stirred with pleasing emotions of beauty and sublimity; but it is not the eye that feels the pleasure of seeing. Again, we listen to the melting strains of soft music, and feel pleasingly subdued, or we hear glad tidings from afar and feel joyful; but it is not the ear that feels in the one case or the other. Of the truth of these statements every one is conscious; it is the soul within that enjoys the pleasure of both sight and hearing. Close the eyes and stop the ears, and isolate the body from the sense of touch, and still the soul will think and stir within, and feast upon, or torture itself with its own thoughts. If there was no other proof of the existence of the soul, one's own thinking, thinking, everlasting thinking, from which we cannot fly, and which we cannot suspend during one wakeful moment, must be proof enough. If any do not regard it, it must be because they think so much that they do not spend one moment in thinking upon the nature, origin, and seat of their own thoughts."

The foregoing we cut from the True Wesleyan of Feb 22. We notice it, because, it is a brief attempt to show that the soul is a "*distinct power* from the" body. This is supposed to be proved by assuming that the "memory belongs" not to "the eye" or "the ear." Now, it does really seem to us that we might as well argue that the eye or the ear is the soul, because the fancied soul would have no "rich scenery" to behold, no "soft music" to "melt it, if it were not for "the eye and the ear." What a poor, blind, senseless, unthinking thing this mighty "soul within the body" is, if the body, with its eyes, ears, and other senses, did not give the poor dark, blind, helpless thing something to *think* about! Why, it never would have a thought, nor anything to think about, if it were not for the bodily senses communicating information to it.

But, says the Wesleyan, "the soul within enjoys the pleasure of both sight and hearing."

Very well. But it would have no "pleasure" to "enjoy" but for the eye, ear, and other senses of *the body.*

Not so, says the Wesleyan, "Close the eyes and stop the ears, and isolate the body from the sense of touch, and still the soul will think and stir within, and feast upon, or torture itself with its own thoughts."

But suppose the eyes, ears and other senses of the body, had never been *opened*, how many *thoughts* would it have to "feast upon, or torture itself with?" Poor dark, blind concern! We may safely affirm that all the philosophy in the universe can never prove that this fancied "immortal soul" could, or would ever possess a thought to feast upon or torture itself with, if the despised *material* body did not first communicate thoughts to it. What "everlasting thinking" "a soul within the body" must perform, if it never had any body to think in, and to supply it with "thoughts!" What demonstration it must be of an immortal "soul within the body," that after the body, with its senses, has supplied it with knowledge it is able to think, when

some of those senses afterwards are "closed!" To make out a case of this kind let the advocates of immortal-soulism *prove*, that this imaginary "distinct power" did think *before* it ever had any bodily senses; and that it does and can think when all the senses of the body are totally extinct; or even when they are so far suspended as to produce unconsciousness while life still remains. Till they can do this, all their fine theories about the nobility and independence of "a soul," fall to the ground like other matters of fancy.

The Wesleyan itself admits, at last, that the "soul's everlasting thinking" can be, and is "suspended" when our "wakeful moments" are past or when we are *asleep*. That is one step towards the truth, and we hope our brother will follow it up; if he does, we doubt not he will soon find that when the "wakeful moments" of life cease, and the sleep of death sets in, all the "soul's everlasting thinking" is "suspended" till the *morning* of the resurrection.

---

REMARKS ON ECCL. ix: 4, 5.—"For to him that is joined to all the living there is hope; for a living dog is better than a dead lion. For the living know that they shall die: but the dead know not any thing, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten."

In the controversy on the state of the dead much has been said on this text; yet we doubt if the full force of it has been seen. The perfect *ignorance* of the dead is clearly the grand idea it is designed to communicate. Mark well the language. "To him that is joined to all the *living* there is hope," however unimproved and ignorant he may be. If he is *alive* he may improve, but if he is dead there is no improvement; and he is of no use while dead: hence, "a *living dog* is better than a *dead lion*." The most unimproved and ignorant man *alive*, is of more value than the most intelligent, wise, and powerful man when *dead*. That dead man might, while living, have been as superior to the uneducated and ignorant survivor as the lion among beasts is superior to a dog; but when dead he is infinitely *inferior* to him; "FOR *the living* [however ignorant and lacking in intelligence in other matters] KNOW [have knowledge enough to know] that they shall die:" a truth which any man, though but one remove above an idiot, possesses intelligence enough to "*know*:" but the dead [are inferior to such persons, as much as "a dead lion" is inferior to "a living dog," *because* "the dead"] *know not* ANYTHING:" total ignorance is the state of all the dead. No language can more absolutely and unequivocally affirm the entire *unconsciousness* of the dead, however powerful their intellect might have been while living. This view is fully confirmed by the tenth verse of the same chapter, where the wise man re-affirms the same truth, that in "sheol"—the state of the dead—"there is *no knowledge*." Till our opponents can give us one text that with any tolerable clearness affirms that dead men have knowledge, we may safely rest the argument here; not because this is the only positive text that affirms the entire ignorance of the dead, but because this text alone outweighs all the arguments our opposers have ever produced or ever can produce from the Bible.

---

"MYSTERIOUS RAPPINGS."—"THE MAN OF SIN."

*Or 2 Thess. 2: 1 to 12 considered.*

On this topic several of our friends have anticipated us, and expressed their dissent from our view that the "*Wicked*" of this chapter, or the real "Anti-Christ," is yet to be revealed. They have kindly cautioned us on this topic, and they will accept our thanks for it. We do not intend to state anything dogmatically, but suggest thoughts which any person will be at liberty to approve, reject, call in question, or enlarge upon. We shall endeavor to give the best light we have on the text under consideration, without going into particulars in detail; but, taking a general view of the subject. For some of the thoughts we are indebted to George Duke of Manchester, in his "Finished Mystery," a work of considerable value.

"The *coming* of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our *gathering together* unto him," is the grand theme of the apostle in the text. This subject had been fully opened in the previous epistle. He had told the Thessalonians, chapter 1: 9, 10, that they were "turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God; and to *wait for his Son from Heaven*." He had said, chap. 2: 19, that such converts were to be his "crown of rejoicing . . . . . in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at his coming." He had expressed his desire that their "hearts" might be "established unblameable in holiness before God, even our Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints"—holy ones. He had fully, chap. 4: 13—18, entered into the subject of the state of the dead, viz: that they were "*asleep*," and the hope for them, viz: That they should arise from the dead, who were "asleep in Christ," when "the Lord *himself* shall descend from heaven;" for which, as Christians, they were "*waiting*." He had warned them that there would be a cry of "peace and safety" before the event of "the day of the Lord" opening; and informed them, that while that cry was in progress "sudden destruction cometh upon them" who make it, and those who believe it; chap. 5; 1—3: but assured those who

were Christ's, that whether they were "awake or asleep," at Christ's coming, they "should live together with him;" chap. 5: 10. He had assured them that the place of meeting Christ would be "*in the air*," chap. 4: 17; and he concludes that Epistle by a wish, or prayer, that they may "be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."

During the interval between the first and second epistle, it seems by some means, the Thessalonians had become impressed that the day of the Lord was either then opened or "impending"—hanging immediately over them, to be at once ushered in; and they had, perhaps, been the more ready to conclude so from the troubles they were then enduring. The apostle opens the second epistle with the encouragement that their "rest" from trouble would take place "when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven;" and that then he would "punish" those who had "troubled" them. After thus recalling to their minds the words of comfort he had drawn from the coming again of Christ, in the previous epistle, he proceeds to the subject which was the occasion of writing this, which was, as already remarked, that the Thessalonians had become impressed with the idea that the day of the Lord had arrived, which caused a *shaking* in their minds, such as led some wholly to abandon worldly employment, as appears from chap. 3: 6—12. To quiet their minds, and prevent these disorders, Paul shows them, chap. 2, that there were prophecies to be fulfilled which forbid the idea that the day of the Lord was then opened, or impending. The original term translated "at hand," signifies also, impending, present, or *has come*. We think it most likely it is here used in the latter sense. Paul had said, we shall be "gathered together unto" Christ "in the air." Either by his "word," while preaching among them, or by his "letter" previously written; or by some "spirit" professing to be of God, the Thessalonians, at least a portion of them, thought the day had arrived, or opened. Paul "beseeches" them not to suffer themselves to be moved to such a conclusion "by any means;" and then proceeds to inform them *why*. He shows them there is to be an "apostacy" such as had not yet occurred; and that was to be succeeded by the revelation of "the man of sin"—"the son of perdition;" that "coming" of the man of sin would be "after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and *lying wonders*," &c.: that he was to "oppose and exalt himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped," &c. Such a power was to be the immediate forerunner of the advent of Christ, who would "destroy *that Wicked*," and "punish with everlasting destruction" those who are the subjects of his deceptions.

The man of sin has by many been supposed to be Papacy: but we think that view may be erroneous, for two reasons. First—Wicked as Papacy is, and has been, it does not answer the description—"Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or *that is worshipped*." Papacy has never proceeded thus far: it has not opposed and exalted itself above the Virgin Mary, whom it has "worshipped," and still worships; as is evident from the acts of the present Pope. Another objection to the application of this prophecy to Papacy is, that the revelation of the man of sin is the sure and certain sign that the day of the Lord is *impending*, or *has come*. So that if Papacy is that power we have already been thirteen hundred years in the day of the Lord without knowing it, and the revelation of that power was not the sure sign to the Church that the day of the Lord had come or was hanging over us.

We, therefore, regard papacy as the "falling away"—*the apostacy*—that was to precede the revelation of the man of sin, and as preparing the way for *him*; and this is manifestly the apostle's order of the events. Let us take the words in *italics*, in verse 3, and transpose them to the close of verse 4; this is done without any violence to the text. We will now read the whole thus:—"Now we beseech you, brethren, by the *coming* of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our *gathering together* unto him [*in the air,*] that ye be not soon shaken in mind . . . . as that the day of Christ is [*impending or present.*] Let no man deceive you by any means; for except there come a falling away [*an* apostacy,] first, and [*second*] that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth *himself* above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God, *that day* [of Christ] *shall not come*," or be present. "Remember ye not, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? But now ye know what withholdeth [the coming of Christ] that he [Christ] might be *revealed* in *his time*."

The Thessalonians were to remember that Christ would be revealed in his time, but that there was at present, and would continue to be, a "withholding" cause, which must be removed before the advent would occur; and that cause is to be looked for in *the place* where the saints are to be gathered unto Christ, *viz:* "*in the air*." Paul had said, that "the prince of the power of the "air is the *spirit* that now worketh in the children of disobedience;" Eph. 2: 2. That same truth he doubtless preached in all the churches; and, of course, to the Thessalonians. The *place* of the meeting of Christ and his saints must be cleared of him who now holds power, there, before the advent, or coming of Christ, can occur. Hence Paul proceeds to say:—"He who now let-

teth [hindereth the coming of Christ] will let [hinder] until *he* be taken [or removed] out of the way;" that is—the prince of the power of the air must be displaced from his present position; which removal will precipitate, or cast him down from the air unto the earth. "And then shall that Wicked be revealed" among men, ultimately—*literally, personally;* not indeed *as* Satan, but as an "angel of *light*"—yea with mighty professions of *love* till he comes to be "exalted above all that is called God, or that is worshipped," casting down alike the worship of the true God, Papal worship, and all else that is worshipped, that he may be *supreme.* "Whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth of [Christ's coming and of our gathering together unto him] that they might be saved. And for this cause [*because* they rejected the truth of Christ's coming, or personal return from heaven] God shall send them strong delusion, *that they should believe a lie;* that they all might be damned who believed not the truth [of Christ's return from heaven to raise his dead saints and change his living ones] but had pleasure in unrighteousness."

They loved sin—they would not have Christ to reign over them, and they are given up to the reign of Satan—the real man of sin—of whom Papacy was only the *forerunner* and shadow. If the shadow has been so horrible what will the *substance* be? Truly may it be said in the language of Rev. 12th: "Wo to the inhabitants of the earth, and of the sea, for the devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth he hath but a short time."

Such we conceive may be the true interpretation of 2 Thess. 2; *viz.*—That Satan, the prince of the power of the air, just prior to the second coming of Christ, will be hurled down from the *air*; that then he, who is the real Man of Sin, will work, first as an angel of light, with great *professions of love;* and will work signs and wonders, by which multitudes will be deceived, and but few escape; for "if possible" he "shall deceive the very elect." Approaching men cautiously at first—pretending to be the spirits of their dead relatives, and still loving them most tenderly, thus gaining their confidence, and filling them with a dread of doing any thing against those departed ones who love them so much, till they are completely captivated by him, and have yielded themselves up to him under the false and assumed names of their husband, wife, child, sister, brother, father, mother, or some great man, thus exciting in them the most intense desire actually to see these loved ones, so that when they can endure it, he will really appear to their senses, with various degrees of clearness as they can bear it, till the way is fully prepared, and the community ripe for the delusion, when Satan either *personally* or in some human being will make his advent, professionally as some great and admired man who is dead, or through some Pope, Priest, or Athiest, whereby all who have rejected the truth of Christ's coming, and of *life only* in him, will be deceived, and Christ will be rejected, and every God except *this God,* 'newly come up.' Then it may come to pass that every man will be put to death that will not do homage to him; yet, praise God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the triumph of the man of sin—the REAL *Anti-Christ*—will be of short continuance; for, he is to be consumed with the spirit of Christ's mouth, and destroyed with the brightness of our Lord's coming. The conflict will be short, yet terrible to the faint-hearted, while it lasts. Then shall we need to take heed to our Lord's words—"Whosoever will save his life shall lose it; and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it." Yea, then may we need the cry of Rev. 14th—"If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God," &c. The strongest truths of God's word, both of threatening and of promise, will then be needed to prevent even the saints from apostacy to the man of sin.

We think it possible, though we do not affirm it, that what are now called the "spirit manifestations," or "spirit knockings," are incipient stages of the great delusion and the advent of the real Anti-Christ, shortly to take place. We warn all, therefore—"*Go not after them, nor follow them;*" beware that you are not taken in this snare of the devil. It is the last game the devil will hazard in this age; and when the real anti-Christ is developed, whose coming cannot be mistaken by the really watchful, and such as are truly waiting for Christ's return, know that the day of the Lord is opened, and your last trial has come. Blessed are all such as shall endure to "the end of the days."

*Then* shall "*the wise understand*" as they have never yet understood; but "none of the wicked shall understand;" but they will go on doing "wickedly" till Christ our "Lord shall be revealed from heaven, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction;" but the saints shall then "stand in" their "lot," and "rest" with Christ. They shall know what that word meaneth—"Blessed is he that waiteth and cometh to the thousand three hundred and five and thirty days:" days which we may yet see are not of that

uncertain character that they need to be *guessed* out; but, which *all* the wise will clearly understand, and which may be found to be literal days. We conclude on this topic, with the following testimony about *Anti-Christ.* Dr. Kitto remarks, that it is "the ruling spirit of error—the enemy of the truth of the gospel," &c.; *that* "is its primary meaning;" he says, "it is the proper title of Satan." He adds—"*Justin Martyr*, in his *Dialogues with Trypho*, describes him as exercising his wrath against christians with special fury in the period immediately preceding the Second Advent. *Cyril* of Jerusalem represents him as reigning *three years and six months* preparatory to the entire destruction of his dominion at the second coming of Christ; and says, he will deceive both Jews and Gentiles; the former, by representing himself as the Messiah; the latter by his magical arts and incantations. St. Chrysoston observes, on 2 Thes. 2: that Anti-Christ will not lead men to idolatry, but will rather abolish the worship of false gods, as well as that of the true God, commanding the world to worship *himself alone* as the only Deity."

We are inclined to the view that the developement of the real Anti-Christ will be Atheism enthroned, perhaps in all the governments of earth, and in particular that the Papal head will take that form. The Prince of the power of the air has tried all forms of religion to cheat and destroy men—paganism, with all its forms of idolatry till they were exhausted in their popularity—then he transformed paganism into Papacy, and has used that till it has become an abhorrence to all reasoning men; and his last dying effort will be to enthrone Atheism; or a rejection of "all that is called God, or that is worshipped." Papacy hitherto has not answered this description, though it has shadowed it forth and prepared the way for it. *The* Anti-Christ" is clearly described by John in his First Epistle, chap. 2, verse 22; "He is [*the*] anti-christ that denieth the Father and the Son." The emphatic "*the*" is in the original. There are and have been, "many anti-christs;" but there is to be revealed *one* who is emphatically "the anti-Christ;" and John clearly designates him as a denier of "*the Father and the Son.*" Such has not been, hitherto, the character of Papacy: it may possibly yet assume it, to adapt itself to the spirit of Atheism that is now spreading in Europe with awful power; for the leading revolutionists there are sworn Atheists. But we may say more on that subject hereafter.

---

MONEY, when carefully mailed to us for the Examiner, is *our loss*, if it does not arrive safe; we wish not to have our subscribers think they must pay it again. We have lost, by the mail, more this year than usual. By the non-arrival of the letter containing the money, delay occurs in sending the paper.

## SCRIPTURE EXPOSITIONS:—I PETER II.

BY THE EDITOR.

[Continued from Vol. V., page 182.]

VERSES 11 and 12.—Dearly beloved, I beseech you as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul; having your conversation honest among the Gentiles: that, whereas they speak against you as evil-doers, they may by your good works, which they shall behold, glorify God in the day of visitation.

"Dearly beloved"—of God; and by the apostle, because his affections were in sympathy with God, "I beseech"—I entreat, beg, implore—"you, as strangers and pilgrims"—those who consider themselves as having no settled home in this passing state, but are travellers or sojourners, passing to another country; a characteristic claimed by all the saints, in all ages—"abstain"—be far from: that is, keep at a distance—"from fleshly"—bodily, corporeal—"lusts"—desires: the original word seems to be from *epi*, upon, and *thumos*, the mind, *to set the mind upon;* perhaps with the idea also of being absorbed with them; as is the case with those who are under the government of their animal nature. Against such a course of life the apostle solemnly warns those who would attain to immortality. Such things he informs them "war against the soul"—*psuchees*—life, spirit, mind, affections, person; that is, the course of life he warns them against tends directly to destroy them utterly and forever; "for, if ye live after the flesh, *ye shall die;* but, if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body ye shall *live.*" Rom. 8: 13. "Having your conversation"—course of life—"honest"—virtuous, upright—"among the Gentiles"—those that know not God—"that whereas they speak against you as evil-doers"—mischievous, ill-disposed, malicious—"they may by your good works"—course of life, or behavior—"which they shall behold"—or see—"glorify"—honor, praise; acknowledge the true excellence of; also, to worship, to adore—"God in the day of visitation"—inspection, deliverance, punishment. What was exactly in the apostle's mind in this expression we are not prepared to say positively. It may have reference to the coming judgments on the nation of Jews, now about to take place, as this epistle is supposed to have been written about three years before the siege of Jerusalem by the Romans. This seems the most probable conclusion, as the visitation was something by which the Gentiles might be led to honor God, or acknowledge his truth. If others think it relates to the revelation of Christ, spoken of in the first chapter, we shall not dispute with them about it. The apostle next gives some specific directions in reference to their conduct to various classes of men, in the relations of life.

VERSES 13—17.—Submit yourselves 'to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme: or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well. For so is the will of God, that with well-doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men: as free, and not using your liberty for a cloak of maliciousness, but as the servants of God. Honor all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honor the king.

"Submit yourselves" *therefore*, [so it reads in the original, the Greek word, *oun*, having been left untranslated] "to every ordinance"—institution, es-

tablishment—"of
whole direction ha
said in the previ
knew not God spal
they should so live
should be led to h
most important wo
stitutions, governn
live; and do this n
allegiance to any
shall soon see—but
themselves to tho
sake, or on accou
have all occasion
moved, and be le
said to Peter "th
paying *tribute*, but
we should offend t
"go thou to the
cometh up, and w
thou shalt find a p
for thee and me."
sion to the rule of
because of any rig
over them; but G
should be stumble
posite course were
governments in or
may have for spe
But submission h
submit by obeying
ingly suffering the
It should always
ments of men do
mands of God;
submission is to m
ing the penalty of
in such a case is t
cast off *his* gove
passively we are,
to every institutio
the king, as [the]
ors [subordinate r
by him [the king
perors, various go
for the punishmen
—"evil doers"—
chievous—"and f
pense: of course,
that do well." T
clearly pointed ou
saints in relation t
before described:
with well doing y
the occasion of the
—*agnosian*—the
men"—men devo
men. "As free"-
liberty: they wer
allegiance alone
though free—"no
a pretext—"of m
chief—"but [use
all your conduct r
tend to the promot
ance of his cause,
gratification under
differing from oth
respect—"all men
dition; for, we a
"Love"—*agapate-*

tablishment—"of man for the Lord's sake." The whole direction has special reference to what was said in the previous verse. That as those who knew not God spake against them as evil doers, they should so live that the enemies of christianity should be led to honor God; and "*therefore*" [a most important word] they should submit to the institutions, governments under which they might live; and do this not because they really owed any allegiance to any of earth's governments—as we shall soon see—but, they were to submit, or arrange themselves to those governments for the Lord's sake, or on account of the Lord, that men might have all occasion for speaking evil of his cause removed, and be led to glorify him. So our Lord said to Peter "the children" were "free" from paying *tribute*, but at the same time added "Lest we should offend them"—or cause them to stumble, "go thou to the sea, and take the fish that first cometh up, and when thou hast opened his mouth thou shalt find a piece of money, that take and give for thee and me." Here is the principle; submission to the rule of men is not required of the saints because of any right the governments of earth have over them; but God requires it of saints lest men should be stumbled and reject his service if an opposite course were pursued. We submit to these governments in order to take away all occasion they may have for speaking evil of the cause of God. But submission has a two-fold aspect: we may submit by obeying their ordinances, or by unresistingly suffering the penalty attached to disobedience. It should always be the former when the enactments of men do not interfere with the plain commands of God; when they do thus interfere, our submission is to manifest itself by passively enduring the penalty of their laws: to actively obey men in such a case is to renounce allegiance to God, and cast off *his* government. But either actively or passively we are, on the Lord's account, to submit to every institution of man; "whether it be unto the king, as [the] supreme [ruler]; or unto governors [subordinate rulers] as unto them that are sent by him [the king—as in the case of Roman Emperors, various governors to Judea and elsewhere] for the punishment of"—or to execute justice upon—"evil doers"—the ill-disposed, malicious, mischievous—"and for the praise"—reward, recompense: of course, implying protection—"of them that do well." The true office of a ruler here is clearly pointed out; and the true position of the saints in relation to that office, viz., submission, as before described: "for so is the will of God, that with well doing ye may put to silence"—take away the occasion of the evil speaking—"the ignorance"—*agnosian*—the unreasonableness—"of foolish men"—men devoid of understanding, inconsiderate men. "As free"—*eleutheroi*—free born, inheriting liberty: they were the Lord's free men, and *owe* allegiance alone to him as their king; and yet, though free—"not using your liberty as a cloak"—a pretext—"of maliciousness"—wickedness, mischief—"but [use it] as servants of God"—having all your conduct regulated by a regard to what will tend to the promotion of his honor and the furtherance of his cause, and not seeking a mere selfish gratification under a pretence of enjoying a liberty differing from other men, but—"honor"—esteem, respect—"all men"—whatever their rank or condition; for, we are all of one family by Adam. "Love"—*agapate*—delight in, prefer, to be strictly united in affection with—"the brotherhood"—those begotten again, the family of Christ, the second Adam. "Fear God. Honor"—esteem, respect—"the king"—the supreme ruler, power, because God requires it.

VERSES 18 and 19.—Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward. For this is thank-worthy, if a man for conscience toward God endure grief, suffering wrongfully.

The term translated "servants" here is not the same as that in Eph. 6: 5, there it is *douloi*; upon which we have remarked—here the word is *oiketai*, and signifies "one living in the same house with any one"—it may include all, whether servants in the ordinary sense of that term, or children, friends, or others residing with the head of the household—"be subject"—*upotassomenoi*—be obedient, be submissive—"to your masters"—*despotais*—a lord, head of a family. It is evident, to our mind, it is in this sense it is used in the text: for, the apostle is descending in the scale of government: first, that of God; next, "the king"—then "governors sent by" the king: he then descends to the government of families by the head, or lord, of the family, or honsehold, and requires all—*oiketai*—dwellers in the household to be subject, obedient, or submissive to the head of the family: without which all would be confusion and strife. God has ordained *order* throughout all his works; and if men would regard that ordinance, all would be peace, harmony, love, and good will. This subjection to heads of families God requires of all that dwell in them—"with all fear"—lest the order and harmony should be broken—"not only to the good"—*agathois*—kind, pure, virtuous—"and gentle"—*epieikesin*—mild, patient—"but also to the froward"—*skoliois*—crooked, peevish, hard to please. The character of the head of a family is not the test of obligation to obey: the government of the worst is better than anarchy: and his authority is not to be resisted so long as it does not directly and palpably clash with the authority of God, of which we are not to judge by our feelings or fancies, but by a plain "thus saith the Lord." That the term *despotes* has come to be used in our day to signify a tyrant, an oppressor, we know; but, we are satisfied, originally, as used by Peter, it had the signification we have given it. If these heads of families are fretful, hard to please, and abusive, those under them should bear it patiently, out of regard for the authority of God, and that his cause may receive no hindrance by their disorderly conduct. In such a course if they "endure grief, suffering wrongfully," God will see that they have their reward, for it is "thankworthy"—*charis*—worthy, in the sight of God, of reward. Surely, we may well suffer wrong patiently, from the most froward head of a family, when by so doing we please God, and he is engaged to see that our patience shall not go unrewarded: but we must see to it that the sufferings we endure are not deserved by our own evil conduct.

VERSE 20.—For what glory is it, if, when ye be buffeted for your faults, ye shall take it patiently? But if, when ye do well, and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God.

"For what glory"—honor, praise—"is it, when ye be buffeted"—*kolaphizomenoi*—boxed, thumped, afflicted, depressed, maltreated, [of course, none but a "froward" head of a family would box or thump

those under him; but if this happen] "for your faults"—for your negligence of the path of obedience, or wilful offences, and "ye take it patiently," surely there is no reward for your sufferings in that case—"but if, when ye do well, and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable"—worthy of reward—"with God"—that is God's estimate of such sufferings.

VERSES 21—25.—For even hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow his steps: who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth: who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously: who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed.

"For even hereunto were ye called"—to suffer patiently when ye do well—"because Christ" whose name ye bear—"also suffered for us"—when we were "froward"—"leaving us an example"—a pattern, a copy to imitate—"that we should follow his steps"—act like him: who did no sin, neither was guile"—deception, fraud, falsehood—"found in his mouth: who when he was reviled"—railed at, reproached, insulted by opprobrious and abusive language—"reviled not again"—did not return it—"when he suffered"—from his enemies, even unto death—"he threatened not"—so far from it, that he wept over Jerusalem when he beheld her coming judgments, and prayed for his murderers while expiring upon the cross—"but committed himself to him that judgeth"—forms an estimate of—"righteously"—justly: that is, however false the estimate of men may be, God will form a just estimate; hence, we may safely, as did our Lord, under all injuries, commit ourselves to God and to his decision; for, Jesus "his own self bare our sins"—that is, he suffered for, or on account of, our sins—not for his own; for he had none—"in his own body"—in his own person—"on the tree"—the cross:—without murmuring, impatience, or any spirit of revenge; but, entirely the reverse; thus leaving us a crowning "example"—[see verse 21] "that we"—learning from his example of patience and confidence in God in that awful hour, might become of like mind and patience, and thus—"being dead unto sins"—having no more to do with sins than a man would have with the desires that occupy animal men in life; being thus dead unto sins, that we "should live unto righteousness," after the example, or pattern, our blessed Saviour set us. For when *self* is conquered, subdued, brought into complete subjection to the will of God, both in active obedience and patient suffering, then, truly, do we live unto righteousness, or unto God, and unto our Lord Jesus Christ—"by whose stripes ye were healed" both of the love and practice of sin. His sufferings, patience, and victory over all his sorrows, has left a lesson for us, that if studied, dwelt upon and made the subject of daily meditation, cannot fail to lead us to God and salvation.

"*Bare our sins in his own body;*" &c. Sin is a moral disease, that needs to be removed. Christ united himself with us, became our elder brother, that he might redeem—deliver us from sin. By his union with us, though he knew no sin, he bare our sins that he might cure us of sin. We will illustrate this point in this way:—Suppose a perfectly healthy man, if such a thing could be done, should consent to have grafted on to, or inserted in his body a diseased member—say, a hand, a foot or an eye: he would actually in that case bear the disease of that member; but, by the overflowing, renovating principle of the life and health in this man, the disease is overcome, and perfect health, strength and vigor restored to the member. Thus Christ bare our sins. We are diseased and perishing. Christ placed himself in connection with us by taking flesh and blood; and if we place ourselves in union with him by the Spirit of God, through faith, then a perfect connection is formed: we partake of Christ's life and health, and he bears our sins, or moral disease, till by the continued action of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus we are cured, or made perfectly whole: thus he bears our sins away, and we are made partakers of the divine nature: abiding in Christ we have our fruit unto holiness and the end everlasting life—or immortality, incorruptibility.

VERSE 25.—For ye were as sheep going astray; but are now returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls.

"For ye were as sheep going astray"—out of the road, seduced, misled, deluded, allured into a false way—"but now are returned"—are brought back, turned about, converted—"unto the Shepherd"—*poimena*—one who tends flocks, a protector, guide, one who cares for others and provides for their welfare—"and Bishop"—*episkopon*—overseer, guardian—"of your souls"—persons, lives: and here, especially, eternal life. Glorious characteristics of our blessed Saviour. Let us love and obey him.

## IMMORTALITY—A FACT.

COMMUNICATED BY P. ALLING.

In "Prideaux Connexion," Vol. 1, p 205, we have an account of the first introduction of the doctrine of *the immortality of the soul* among the Grecian philosophers, (about 500 years B. C.) by Pythagoras, a disciple of Zoroastres, the famous Persian impostor or prophet of the magicians; who, (says Prideaux,) "was the most ancient of any whom we have upon record, of all the heathen nations who taught it."—It appears that he was of Jewish origin, well versed in their religion, as also in the sciences of his day. That in his system he incorporated large portions of the law of Moses, the Psalms, &c., with the magian religion, and claimed Abraham as its father. Many of his ceremonies were similar to those of the Jews. His system was as widely extended and universal as that of Mohamed, and he himself was regarded in like manner as a prophet, who received his communications from the great God of the universe. His account of Creation, the flood, &c. agrees with the account given by Moses. The great distinguishing characteristics of worship were, they regarded and worshipped fire and light as symbols of purity, perfection, &c., and darkness as its opposite. In the present state good and evil were blended as is light and darkness; but in the resurrection, (which they appeared to believe would be literal,) the virtuous would pass into light ineffable, and the wicked into an unending state of darkness, &c. That that religion continued until supplanted by the Mohammetans, and even unto this day fragments of its worshippers are to be found in the oriental world.

As many of the Jews after the Babylonish captivity remained scattered over the Persian empire,

and were identified with its institutions, we can readily see the manner in which they became tinctured with *the heathen dogma* of *man's natural immortality*. We may also understand the manner in which the heathen world generally became acquainted with the Mosaic account of the creation, flood, &c. Prideaux was a believer in the immortal-soul theory; and infers, that Daniel, and other prophets of Israel, before Zoroastres, believed the same; but, as he brings no proof, and as their writings teach nothing of the kind, I must believe his inferences on that point are not sustainable.

### From C. W. Low.

*Fredonia, N. Y., January*, 1851.

*Br. Storrs,*—I wish to ask you one or two questions.

1. In the 20th of Luke, from the 27th to the 37th verse, what particular or grand fact does the Saviour prove? Is it, that the souls of departed, or dead men are alive in the spirit-world? or, that there will be a resurrection of the dead,—or both? I think it is the latter, viz: a resurrection, and that only. What say you?

2. We are taught by the popular theory of the day, that we have committed to our trust, an immortal soul, to be fitted for the skies. What I wish to know is, if the "*we*" is one being, and mortal, and the soul committed is another being, and immortal? If these things be true, what will become of the "*us*," to whom the soul is committed, if it be lost? Again, I heard a Methodist preacher say, last Sunday evening, that the righteous when they die, go to a place of safety and happiness, called paradise, or Abraham's bosom; there they remain until the judgment; that the wicked, when he died, went down to endless night and wo, and there remained until judgment. Now, Bro. Storrs, if this be true, will there be any in the grave to hear the voice of God? Will there be any asleep in the dust of the earth? I wish you to say a few words on these three points. If I could write I would try to say more. With these broken thoughts I subscribe myself your friend and brother, looking for the coming of Christ.

We do not see that anything more need be said now, than what Bro. Low has said on the three points. It is only necessary to state the questions, as he has done, to show the absurdity of any other conclusions than those at which he has arrived.—On the first, it is most obvious that the question of the Sadducees, Luke 20th, relates wholly to the resurrection; and to suppose that our Lord answered them with any other design than to prove that fact, is to suppose that he evaded the question. If it had been true that the Patriarchs were alive at that time, that could not prove the resurrection—the very point in dispute; and the Sadducees could not have been silenced, as they were.

### A Noble Stand.

The following letter from Br. C. M. Richmond, is of too much interest to be kept "*confidential;*" and he must excuse us for making it public. We do it that all who suffer for the truth, may be encouraged not to faint; and that those who have the means, should be moved to extend a helping hand to sustain such true-hearted men, who choose to suffer, rather than betray the Truth. Let none who have this world's good content themselves with barely saying, "The Lord bless such brethren." How much do you want them "blessed?" "It is more blessed to give than to receive." Do you believe that? *We know it.* Such men as Br. Richmond, Br. Tate, and others of like spirit, should be sustained, and not left to struggle alone.

We have just received a note from Br. Tate, acknowledging the receipt of $3, we had the privilege of sending him from Br. Wybell, of St. Louis, in which he says, "I hardly know how to record my gratitude to him, to you, and to our Father in Heaven. From and through you, I have received the means of supporting my family in our solitude. I hope some time to give you substantial proof of my gratitude." This very acknowledgment is pay a thousand fold for the little help we have been the means of sending him the winter past. We hope soon to see Br. Tate and Br. Richmond, doing efficient service in travelling and proclaiming the truth. Let them be helped to do so. Br. Tate's address is Grandville, Kent co., Michigan. Most of our readers will remember his conflict with the New Eng. Conf. of Wesleyans, and his subsequent removal to the West. See Examiner for last year, especially December number.

Br. Richmond, we think, should be sustained, also, in "*the west,*" where help is needed. Br. Battersby, at St. Louis, writes us, "For the love of souls, try and come here." We would gladly go if we saw any way to do so; at present we do not. Let those brethren laboring in the West be sustained. The harvest is great, and the Lord is raising up men there to do the work; but they must have bread for themselves and their families. Ye who have gold and silver, do not let it canker in your hands, when the fields are white to harvest, and the Lord is giving the men who are willing to do the work. Let them be fed. Not from the mere *crumbs* that fall from your tables, but from the *prosperity* that God has given you. "We brought nothing into the world, and can carry nothing out;" but many there are, who could, if they would, feed God's hungry laborers, and so *share* the reward.

Here is brother Richmond's Letter. Read it; and ask yourself if you have not something to help such men of God, and act out your conviction at once.

Bro. Storrs,—Permit me to sit down and enjoy the privilege of a free and *confidential* conversation with you, who will, I am sure, appreciate the trials and encouragements, the joys and sorrows, that surround me. I have recently passed through the most severe trial of my whole life. With the Baptist Church I have been connected, *as pastor*, for about ten years. And such has been the strength

of my attachment to that denomination, and my brethren in the ministry, that I have tried hard, as my views began to change from "*orthodoxy*" (?) to labor in the cause of my Master without changing my old relations. I was intending to remain in the Baptist ministry during life, though conscious that I could not stand as a *very* "*sound minister.*" I have therefore tried the "*say-not-much-about-it*" principle; always conforming my preaching to my views of the destruction of the wicked and the sleep of the dead. I wished not to make my views *prominent* lest I might injure the unity of the church. But blessed be God, He gave me no rest in this *accommodation* system. I felt that I could not do my whole duty without preaching the whole truth. I therefore laid the subject before the church, and resigned the pastoral charge. And now, my dear brother, *I am free!* I feel that I have taken the right step. It was extremely afflicting to me and my brethren and sisters, to separate myself thus from them. I love them dearly as the children of my Father, with whom I hope to walk the golden streets of the New Jerusalem, but I am willing to make any sacrifice, I hope, for the Truth's sake. I never anticipate being again connected with a Baptist church as Pastor. I must not be gagged. *I must be free.* If there is provision made in this free government for us to worship God as we choose, we ought to avail ourselves of so rich a boon. I am sorrowful and yet rejoicing. I have a few in this place who rally around me—encourage me, and hold me up in this trying day. But most of the professed Christians, Baptists and all others, turn a *cold side*, and will scarcely call me *brother.*

Last Saturday I resigned my charge of the church. Monday I commenced a course of lectures, on the "*Mortality of the Soul*"---"*The unconscious state of the Dead*"---"The reward of the righteous, and the punishment of the wicked at the judgment, and not at death"---and "*Destruction*, not endless pain, the penalty of God's law." These lectures were well attended, notice of them being given by hand-bills posted up throughout the town. Intense excitement prevails. Every body is talking and reading their Bibles on the subject. The Baptists are grieved to think I take the course I do; and I am truly sorry for them; but how can I help it? I must preach God's word; and the truth will do no harm.—About a dozen in this place believe the truth on the above subjects. Others are thinking, and I have no doubt much good will be the result. I have enlisted and I *cannot—wish not to—retreat.* I shall, by God's grace, contend for the truth, though the storm may rage with its utmost violence around me and upon me.

It encourages me, that those brothers who are on the truth, are as pious and devoted brethren as any in the place. Their influence is felt. Brother H. who takes the *Examiner*, is a precious brother of the Baptist Church, and exerts a good influence, both for vital piety, and in favor of our views.

I know not what is before me. I wish "*to be, to do, and to suffer*" all the will of God. He will direct. I am *poor*, and have a family (wife and one child) to support. But if I had the means, I would rejoice in the privilege of spending my life in the blessed cause of preaching God's long neglected truth.

The West is a rich field, over which to sow the good seed. The mind out here is not, upon the whole, I think, immovably fixed in old stale errors. It is in a more plastic, formative state. But I think on some accounts I shall return to New York State.---At *present* my post-office address is here.

Yours, affectionately, C. M. RICHMOND.

*Peru, Miami Co., Ind.* March 7, 1851.

---

FROM JAMES BATTERSBY.

*Saint Louis, Mo. March 2nd*, 1851.

BRO. STORRS,— I again write to give you the names of a few more subscribers to your valuable and cheering paper. When I removed from New York city to this state, some eighteen months ago, I knew not of a single believer in the place. I have endeavored cautiously, but firmly, to awaken an interest on the subject of "life and death"—the "near coming of Christ"—the "Kingdom of God," and all the other sublime truths connected so intimately with the one first named. I find that the success of the advent truth depends, in a great measure, upon the correct understanding of the nature of man, and the character of the Bible hope. If it is a truth that the *entire man* is *mortal* (and that it is, we receive the concurrent testimony of scripture and reason) then it is obvious that A Redeemer is necessary to "shew us the path of life" and give us, at the proper time, "immortality." The time when we receive this gift at once introduces us to the coming of the Saviour in his kingly power and clothed with regal authority. I do thank God that such a Saviour has been provided; and in embracing the truth that "life and immortality is brought to light" through such a Saviour, I do not rob him of his glory, as does the old theory, nor pluck one laurel from the diadem which encircles his brow. This subject has at length attracted attention: and I sincerely pray that many may yet see and rejoice in the truth. Dr. Whiting, whose acquaintance I have recently made, informed me that your Six Sermons were the means of his conversion, some 6 or 7 years ago; and he rejoiced to know he could have intercourse with you through the medium of your paper. The wife of Br. Yeats, who had for some time resisted this truth, told me, when on a sick bed, the pleasure and glory which filled her heart when she yielded to her convictions of the truth on this subject. "O, Bro. Battersby," says she, "the scripture is a new volume to me; it is as if a curtain had been lifted up, and I now feel it a privilege to read where before I was afraid." Bro. Yeats is at present a member of the Methodist E. Church, and much respected. Yet he has taken a bold stand for the truth which will doubtless subject him to persecution; but undaunted he perseveres in giving them truth. I know it would do you good to see his zeal, and hear him talk. He declared to me, that he never enjoyed so much of the spirit of christianity as since he became decided in these views.

Are you comming west? For the love of souls, try and come here. I think you ought to come for awhile.

[Br. Yeats' letter will appear at another time.—ED]

---

PAWLING, N. Y.—If our friend in that place, who sent us a letter with money for some of the "Six Sermons," under date of "March 8th," will send us his or her name, we will forward the works immediately. There was no name to the letter, and we have no knowledge of an indivtdual in that place, as we send no Examiner there; though the writer says, that somebody sends it.

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VI. PHILADELPHIA, MAY, 1851. NO. 5.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,

At 68 North Eighth Street, between Arch and Cherry,

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

**TERMS.**—Single copy, for one year, $1; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; always in advance.

## IMMORTALITY—ETERNAL LIFE.

BY WM. GLEN MONCRIEFF, SCOTLAND..

*"To them who, by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory, and honor, and immortality, eternal life."* Rom. II. 7.

The reader will please to observe that the passage before us constitutes part of a two-fold exhibition of the awards of the judgment-day, or of the future destinies of men, accompanied with a statement of the grounds by which they are to be determined. "God will," says the 6th verse, "render to every man according to his works." Our subject of consideration refers to the holy and their transcendent destiny. "To them who, by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory, honor, and immortality, (God will render, v. 6th,) eternal life;" and the following verses record the doom of the finally impenitent and rebellious. "But unto them that are contentious and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, (God will render) indignation and wrath," &c. By explaining the first, we will with sufficient clearness apprehend the meaning of both, and may we the while yield up our whole being to the teaching of infallible wisdom as it utters in our hearing its salutary lessons. For the sake of perspicuity, we shall divide our subject into two parts:

I. WHAT BLESSINGS ARE TO BE SOUGHT FOR, and

II. HOW THEY ARE TO BE OBTAINED.

I. THE BLESSINGS *are glory, honor, and immortality*," summed up in the two concluding words "*eternal life.*" We even here take upon us the liberty of affirming that they are condensed into a focus by the phrase "eternal life," for that which is to be conferred must have been that which was sought for; so that it cannot be wrong, but on the contrary, most lawful, were we to express the substance and force of the text thus: "To them who, &c., ——— seek for eternal life, God will render eternal life;" as we find it in a parallel verse, "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life." This "glory, honor, and immortality," in a word, "eternal life," must be sought for, and sought for in the divinely specified course. We shall give our chief attention to the "immortality," and then shortly glance at the "glory and honor," which are to be sought for also as its accompaniments in the after state.

The Greek word here translated "immortality," is *aphtharsian*, literally INCORRUPTION, from the verb *phtheirō*, to spoil, corrupt, destroy. *Phtharsia* is corruption, aph*tharsia*, of which *aphtharsian*, the word under notice, is the accusative case singular—means without corruption, or incorruption. The word occurs in one or other of its forms in the text we are now to quote: "This corruptible must put on incorruption"—*aphtharsian*—1 Cor. xv. 53, and also v. 54 of the same chapter. "Our Saviour Jesus Christ, hath ~~abolished~~ brought life and immortality (*aphtharsian*) to light by his gospel"—2 Tim. i, 10. "To an inheritance incorruptible"—aphtharton—1 Peter i; 4; also, 1 Tim. i, 17; and Rom. i, 23. The proper word for immortality, deathlessness, is *athanatos*, and these two terms should have invariably been rendered by their proper English symbol, for there is a difference, we suggest, in their import. That which is mortal may not be corruptible, though certainly that which is corruptible in its constitution is mortal. The eternal God, being a pure, unorganized, self-existing spirit, is both immortal and incorruptible; and if there were in the universe as pure creature-spirits as immortal-soulists can imagine, they might be mortal, that is, the term of their duration in consciousness might be limited, though they would be incorruptible, or incapable of becoming rotten and loathsome like "the earthly house of this tabernacle" in which we reside. In some sense, it is universally allowed that man as he is may be described by both of these terms—mortal and corruptible; the last necessarily, as formerly observed, including the first. In what sense, then, do we "mortal" and "corruptible" beings require to seek for incorruption? Or, what is the immortality or incorruption here spoken of? Let us examine some of the interpretations that we have seen advanced on different occasions, and by a little patience we may hope to discover the truth.

1st. It has been proposed to understand the term as meaning "sincerity," viewing it entirely as a metaphorical use of the Greek word *aphtharsian*. Of this usage we have unquestionably one example in Titus, ii. 7, "in doctrine showing uncorruptness, gravity, sincerity"—*aphtharsian*. We find not the smallest reason to object to the rendering in Titus, for the term in that passage is employed figuratively, in other words, to designate *a good state* of mind; but its being used this way in one place, is surely no warrant for understanding it always in a figurative mode. Without a doubt it may be used figuratively and literally: it may denote the constitution of a being, or the state of mind and heart in him. In what manner is it employed in the verse engaging our attention? Now it is a fatal objection to the term as a figure in the text, that by so regarding it, we are compelled to confound an end with the means; it is by sincerity and other excellence that the "incorruption" is to be sought for. Can there be "patient continuance in *well doing*" without sincerity? The idea is preposterous and absurd in the extreme. Men are therefore not commanded to seek for future sincerity, but by present, sincere and persevering well-doing, to endeavor after the "incorruption," or incorruptible resurrected being.

2d. Another interpretation is similar to the above, but generalizes the moral excellence. It is not, say the propounders of this view, sincerity, but moral incorruptness in general that is to be sought for. We ask how can there be patient continuance in well doing without spiritual integrity and virtue? The "incorruption" is a state of existence to be gained by

present moral incorruptness, and none but those who cherish and manifest this character will reach the prize.

But, it may be said, if it is not incorruption in the sense of a holy moral state of being, may it not be a final confirmation in such a state? To us it is sufficient to reply, that the text does not speak of confirmation in incorruption, but of incorruption itself, and we desire to have as holy an abhorrence of the custom of adding to God's words, as of taking from them. Moreover, the idea of confirmation in holiness, generally understood, is in itself, to our minds, as unphilosophical as it is unscriptural. That any free moral agent (and how could an agent be moral and unfree?) can be so placed in the universe as to make it an impossibility for him to sin, is in our eyes the climax of absurdity: indeed, if he could not sin, there would be no virtue, no moral excellence and loveliness in his submission to the divine requirements. We firmly believe that sinning will be absolutely unknown in the "new earth," wherein righteousness shall alone flourish in the richest luxuriance; but transgression will be absent only in the sense that the individuals will voluntarily obey the statutes of their King, and continue of choice to do so. This is all the perpetuation that we can imagine, and it is quite different from the common notion about sainted compulsory confirmation in righteousness; the twin-sister, by the way, of forced and not moral and voluntary conversions in time.

3d. Others view the word *aphtharsian* as adjectively qualifying the two preceding nouns "glory and honor," and read the verse in this manner, "who by patient continuance in well doing seek for immortal glory and honor," &c. And here we cannot adopt a better plan than to quote a few judicious sentences bearing exactly on this point, from the pen of our esteemed friend, Mr. Dobney:

"I still feel compelled to adhere to our English version of this text, which represents the righteous, by patient continuance in well doing, seeking for glory and honor and immortality, notwithstanding the Reviewer, with whom it is true are most expositors, says: The position of the word immortality, at the close of the sentence, requires it to be regarded, after the Greek idiom, as an adjective; so giving to the whole phrase the idea of immortal glory and honor.' Now, I respectfully ask, what is the Greek idiom that *requires* this rendering? That the figure *hendiadys* is often used, I most cheerfully concede. But surely no one will affirm that when two or more nouns come together, the last must be construed adjectively; for how many texts occur to the mind in a moment which refuse submission to such a rule. Take, for instance, the phrase in v. 10 of the same chapter: 'But glory, honor, and peace to every man that worketh good;' no man renders it 'peaceful glory and honor;' and v. 4, 'Despiseth thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance, *and long suffering?*' 'I am the resurrection and *the life*,' does not mean 'I am the living resurrection. So 'Christ is made unto us wisdom, righteousness, and sanctification and redemption; where, as I have already shown, is a beautiful gradation and rise in the thought suggested, till we come to the last magnificent result. 'He that prophesieth, speaketh unto men to edification and *comfort*.' 'There shall be weeping, wailing and gnashing of teeth,' &c., &c.

"Now, since reason cannot prove man immortal, and since the general tenor of scripture seems to make immortality contingent, it appears to me a somewhat arbitrary thing for expositors to affirm that the word immortality is used adjectively here; and I feel bound to retain it as our English version gives it, which represents immortality as a blessing to be sought for."—*Future Punishment*, p. 215, Lon. edition.

4th. Others would enforce upon us the idea that the "immortality" here spoken of is immortal happiness. We observe that this interpretation is guilty of adding to God's word, a course which we have already reprobated, and which will be condemned by every pious man who would reflect for a moment on the nature of the offence and its pernicious tendencies. In all truth if one shall add happiness to the "immortal," I know no reason why another might not prefer his addition, and append to the adjective, lawlessness, epicureanism, or anything that might suit his taste. The Bible was given us not to be enlarged by our apocryphal addition, but to be honestly interpreted, like any other document, for our guidance and salvation. But again, it is plain this interpretation is based on the popular notion of man's natural immortality, which is no where inculcated in the book of inspiration. We never saw one passage that made the slightest approach to such a dogma; and we can point to hundreds that give a flat contradiction to the reigning notion. This is the language of inspiration—"The soul that sinneth, it shall die;" "All the wicked will God destroy:" these and all such authoritative announcements concerning the doom of the unholy settle the question in the clearest manner. Like many others, we once believed the pagan notion of human immortality, and had all the prejudice of early and theological training to contend with in our inquiry after the truth as to man's condition and prospects; nevertheless, a victory was gained by us, and we view man as a candidate for immortal being, and not already an heir to it.

5th. Another exposition we have become acquainted with is bodily incorruption, associated, however, in the teaching of its advancers with the doctrine of the soul's immortality. Now this is an approximation to what we esteem to be the truth, and we are always glad when we see our friends and brethren making an approach to the correct view of the great question on which we so widely differ from them. But let us examine this interpretation for a few moments. One thing we request the reader to observe, which necessarily results from the view in question is, that if corporeal incorruptibility must be sought for, none but the righteous will attain to it, either by a resurrection or transformation at the coming of our Lord. If so, the wicked will be raised corruptible, and therefore subject to corporeal dissolution, for that which is corruptible is mortal, a corruptible immortal thing being a contradiction in terms. Confessedly, then, the wicked will again be disembodied, even supposing their spirits may survive that event, as they are imagined to survive the first dissolution of their corruptible dwelling, and live in a separate state till the hour of resurrection. In some *literal* sense, then, they will die "the second death," and that they will survive it, as disembodied souls, is an assertion that would need to be established by solid scriptural arguments before it could be admitted by a considerable thinker. In harmony with the inferential truth now manifested, it is worthy of observation, that the scriptures represent the righteous alone as coming forth from the tomb with incorruptible bodies; as, for instance, "it is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption."—1 Cor. xv. 43; Comp. v. 48 and 57, 58.

But further, on what ground could any interpreter maintain that the souls of the resurrected corporeally corruptible wicked are destined to ceaseless being? With the question as to the possibility of consciousness surviving death, as is generally conceived to be the case, we intend not on this occasion to intermeddle; it is amply sufficient for our present aim to take the popular opinion that our nature is compound, and argue with its maintainers the point of immortality as a property of the soul. Well, then, how can it be proven that the souls of the wicked are to exist forever? Have they immortal souls? Again, we press on the notice of opposing parties, and we affectionately entreat them to consider the fact that the natural immortality of the soul is never taught in the Bible, and that immortality in no sense is ever ascribed to the wicked. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul, but rather fear him who is able to destroy (and will destroy) both soul and body in hell." "Behold all they that are incensed against thee shall be ashamed, and confounded, they shall be *as nothing*, and they that strive with thee shall *perish*."—Ezek. xviii. 4; Matt. x, 28; Isa. xli. 11, 12. Of course the argument would be even more powerful, unanswerable as it is, could it be proven that man is not a compound being, having a soul capable of disembodied existence, and that therefore death necessarily concludes his experience and consciousness entirely. On this inquiry, however, as previously stated, we do not at present enter, though we may suggest for the reader's consideration such things as these—the very idea of death, the fact that death is spoken of as a sleep, and more particularly such inspired statements as "the dead praise not the Lord," "the dead know not anything."—Ps. 115: 17; Eccl. 9: 5 and 6 vs.

6th. Need we ask now what is the correct exposition of the word "incorruption?" It is that immortal existence in the future world, which Jesus has brought to light by his gospel, and which will be granted to all those who rightly seek for it here. Our present being is frail and decaying, and at the termination of our period of duration on earth, death consigns us to the grave, and that which was corruptible, wastes and dissolves in the dust. Dust we are and return to it again. Life closes for the time, and at the resurrection we shall awake either corruptible or incorruptible—deathless or to die. "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." Strictly speaking, no life can be designated corruptible, since the life, the vital force, though it may expire, cannot surely rot and dissipate like a carcase. But life may be in a corruptible or in an incorruptible being, and of course the constitution of the creature will determine the possible duration of the life. An animal being is constitutionally corruptible, and therefore will die; but even an incorruptible being is not necessarily immortal. He might die, if that should be the will of God, for what he makes he can as easily destroy. All that we can determine is that the incorruptible and therefore unanimal constitution is freed from subjection to all those influences which tend to reduce an organized animal being to destruction. Eternal life could only exist in beings organized as we are by a perpetual miracle counteracting the inherent tendencies to decay, and the outward forces that co-operate with and invigorate these tendencies; and the revelating in regard to the future state of the righteous shows us clearly that in their promised incorruptibility, there shall be no decaying tendencies such as those with which we are familiar, hence no perpetual miracle to prolong their being will be demanded. In some extraordinary cases the Almighty has even rendered for the time fleshly organization as enduring as if it had been immortal and incorruptible, as in the example of the three Hebrews who were cast into the fiery furnace and came forth uninjured; and it matters nothing whether we regard the miracle wrought upon them, or in the suspension of the destroying power of the flames in which they were enveloped. At last we see the righteous are to gain an incorruptible form and constitution, and this insinuation shows us how the life can be eternal, without a miracle, always, however, leaving them to be dependent on the Almighty-sustaining arm, but to endure by the laws of their being forever, as we by the laws of our present constitution only endure for a time, and in some cases that of the briefest duration.

"When Christ who is OUR LIFE shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory. It doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is." "Who shall change our vile body that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the work whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself." Such predictive announcements cast a blaze of light on the future events in the history of the victorious saints, and may well impart to the living righteous a joy and gratitude exceeding the utterance of angel's tongue. "Christ is our life," and he will infuse the quenchless vitality into his people when he summons them from the dust; and as he became like us when "the Word was made flesh," in the fullness of time, we shall thus eventually become like him, now that he is glorified, and beyond the dominion of death. Now we have the animal being, and, if worthy, we enter at last in the higher condition of creature existence, that is, the the spiritual, the climax of dependent being and duration. 1 Cor. xv. 35–46. Apparently such is the order of progression in the universe; and it is infinite mercy in God that invites our race to ascend from the lower to the higher through the new and mediatorial arrangement established in Jesus, after, in Eden, the original plan prescribed by Heaven was voluntarily despised and frustrated by the representative of the human family. Gen. ii. 4, 14, 22; John vi. 50; Rom. vi. 23.

This incorruptibility of existence is not merely to be sought for, but also the glories and honors to be assigned to the heirs of the everlasting kingdom. What these are can at present be but dimly understood, for they are subjects of revelation rather general and cloudy—though we admit the clouds are excessively brilliant—than of specific, clearly intelligible announcement. A few passages may be adduced to illustrate the point, but on them we do not purpose to enlarge: "Great is your reward in heaven—Thou shalt be ruler over ten cities—To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame and am set down with my Father in his throne—They shall walk with me in white for they are worthy," &c., &c.

To those, then, who, in the appointed way, seek for glory, honor, and incorruption, God will render "eternal life," a phrase which here expresses immortality and all its associated grandeur and blessedness. Radically, no doubt, it simply expresses ceaseless duration of conscious being, but as they who are to be continued in existence perpetually are the holy ones, and as they are to dwell in the midst of all that can delight the intellect and ravish the heart, we can conclude nothing but that the idea of

blessedness and glory are embraced in the words "eternal life." Other passages speak clearly what we regard as thus presented impliedly, and delightful are the announcements to which we refer. They are such as these: "Now we see through a glass darkly, but then face to face"—"Then shall I know even as I am known"—"In thy presence there is fulness of joy, at thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore," &c., &c. What a scene opens up to the eye of Faith as she looks forward to the appearing of the Redeemer! What splendid visions the new heavens and the new earth, to be tenanted by the blessed! What a contrast to the lot of the condemned, and the blackness of darkness with its unbroken reign!

II. We now proceed to consider THE MEANS whereby the glorious immortality is to be obtained—"By patient continuance in well doing."

"Well doing" includes a right state of heart and conduct towards God and men; having the mind in us that was in Jesus Christ: denying ourselves unto ungodliness and worldly lusts, and living soberly, righteously and godly. It may be summed up thus: it is a lowly and continuous imitation of the Son of God. Philosophically speaking, it is to act through life under the guidance of a heaven-enlightened intellect; and impelled in our conduct by veneration, benevolence and justice, keeping our appetites and inferior sentiments under the dominion of these moral attributes of our nature. In this manner the holy religion teaches us to behave ourselves before our Father in heaven, and in our transactions with our brethren of mankind. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart—and thy neighbor as thyself." But Christianity not merely inculcates this course of procedure as the only mode of life befitting us as responsible agents, and as the only one that can receive the Divine approbation, but it furnishes *most powerful motives and supports* to such conduct, and it is chiefly to these that we would for a little solicit the reader's attention. It is here that much of the popular Christian teaching fails, and on no subject could a lack of information be more discouraging and deleterious. Men require not so much at this day to have the will of God explained to them as to be enlightened concerning the fountains of divine strength and stimulus provided for their gracious use. It is moral health and vital force that is needed, and the momentous inquiry arises, how are they to be obtained?

And here suffer us to make one remark of a general nature, that as the cure required for men is a moral one, only moral remedies are to be sought for. All physical influences to renew men are, in our judgment, no where promised in the Bible, no where in that volume ever said to be needed, or at any time employed for the moral regeneration of the sons of men. Indeed, if they were necessary, it seems to us impossible for any human being in his senses, to blame himself or his neighbor for being without them, and all that they are supposed to be capable of effecting. What influence but a moral one can act on mind? How can a moral agent be enlightened and swayed and bettered, except by motive, argument and persuasion, addressed to his understanding, conscience and heart. "My Spirit;" said the Lord to Noah, the antedeluvian preacher of righteousness, "My Spirit shall not always strive with men." Was this a physical exercise of omnipotence on the minds of the opposing sinners of that time? What! Almighty strength needing to strive with absolute weakness! Is not the very idea of Omnipotence having *to strive* to accomplish any physical result a contradiction in terms? But Jehovah's Spirit was striving with these sinners, and the very language in the verse we are remarking upon, demonstrates that the result was not to be gained by an operation of physical power at all. He strove with them by *the arguments of love and warning*, and the end he had before him was to incline them from the road of sin and destruction. And still is He striving with human sinners, and especially with those who are under the sound of His gospel, which he has pronounced to be "the POWER OF GOD UNTO SALVATION TO EVERY ONE THAT BELIEVETH." It is moral power that is provided and employed, and it is vain to dream of conversion and sanctification from any other agency whatever: this doctrine alone harmonizes with sound views of what a moral agent is, and alone leaves each of us to feel himself *culpable* should he continue under the dominion of sin.

And now let us contemplate some of the quickening and sustaining moral forces that God employs with us, having a natural and delightful tendency to incline us to persevere in well doing in hope of the kingdom that is incorruptible and superlatively glorious.

1. The Bible reveals the love of God for every sinner. Continually ought the Divine love to be exhibited in its *two-fold* aspects—the love of compassion and the love of approbation; and unless this is done a most withering blast will be swept across the hearts of awakened sinners. God pities, compassionates every guilty child of man; and He loves the righteous because to a certain extent they reflect His moral likeness. There is immense compassion in the heart of God for each human being viewed *as a sinner*; and we have it gloriously manifest in John iii. 16: "God so loved the world (the sinful world of mankind) that he gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." Here, then, is love in God for us prior to any love in us for Him; and every man is urged to believe this, or to admit, as a truth, with all its cheering and consoling influence, into his heart. We have often met troubled inquirers who were on the brink of despair because they were ignorant of the Divine love for their souls, and imagined that they had to endeavor to kindle compassion toward them in the bosom of the Almighty, and were striving in various ways, such as by tears and prayers and penitence, to accomplish this end. No wonder, then, they were miserable, for the text we have just quoted from John, convinces us that the labor was in vain, and in fact, though they were unconscious of it, exceedingly dishonoring to Him that sitteth upon the throne. "We love him because he *first* loved us," 1 John iv. 19, is the language of New Testament saints, and of all scripturally enlightened piety. It is the fire in the hearth that warms us, not we that kindle and warm the burning coals. We do not require to awaken for ourselves love in the bosom of our Heavenly Parent; indeed, how could we effect any such result? It is, however, our unspeakable privilege to behold the compassion for each of us already in existence there, where it has lived from the first of days. O! most wonderful and transporting consideration! My sinful brother! behold thy God, and learn that he loves thee now, *just as thou art*, with an infinite and most enduring pity. This vast love induced Him to send His "only begotten Son," to bear each of our sins "in his own body on the tree," that through Him we might live forever. "Herein is love, *not that we loved God*, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins." 1 John iv. 10. Think of the gift—how

precious! how needful! h
Heaven's unborn pity for
the vile and the guiltiest

2d. The Bible reveals t
sinner. "He tasted deat
a man, I say "He loved
me," and we entreat ever
diately to adopt the same
himself. Not many day
with a woman who had f
because she did not know
her; and very wretched s
was more astounding to
lieved He had died for h
risen, and had never been
whom she had frequently
cend to the simple and
Jesus must have loved he
become a sacrifice on Cal
might be saved. By a lit
her to discover that by th
her, she was authorized
of Paul and to say, "Th
gave himself for *me*." T
Saviour who had loved h
still, dissipated her terro
eunuch, she went from us
soothing and morally po
ral words of Luther—"T
gave himself for me. It
loved the Son of God, an
Who is that 'me?' Ever
sinner, so dearly belove
gave himself for me." H
is nothing else but joy a
and broken heart, as her
teth him out with this m
title when he saith "whi
self for me." Read ther
these words "*me*" and "
practise with thyself, th
mayest conceive and poi
and apply it unto thyself
art of the number of th
longeth."—*On Galatians*

3d. The Bible reveals
have forgiveness of all hi
are remitted. Jesus, "
transgressions," has bee
unto Israel and the remi
waits to be gracious to a
name of His Son Jesus.
text "if we confess our si
forgive us our sins, and
righteousness:" 1 John i.
couraging and blissful to
sinned against his Make
seek for mercy and it sh
redemption through his
sins." And how, some
know when God has par
swer, fulfill the condition
"Ask and ye shall receiv
name of Jesus, and when
that your request is besto
you any warrant to expe
or to be sure that you ha
promise of God enough—
for you to stand upon an
in dreams and impressio
signs of diverse order, bu
toms, and can only mock
your God. "Ask and ye

precious! how needful! how free! and no more doubt Heaven's unborn pity for you, though the vilest of the vile and the guiltiest of the guilty!

2d. The Bible reveals the love of Jesus for every sinner. "He tasted death for every man," and being a man, I say "He loved me and gave Himself for me," and we entreat every sinful brother man immediately to adopt the same language with reference to himself. Not many days ago, we were conversing with a woman who had for long years been unhappy because she did not know if Jesus had any love for her; and very wretched she had often been. What was more astounding to us was the fact that she believed He had died for her, and yet she had never risen, and had never been taught by her minister—to whom she had frequently opened up her case—to ascend to the simple and self-evident conclusion that Jesus must have loved her, else He never would have become a sacrifice on Calvary for her sins, that she might be saved. By a little conversation we enabled her to discover that by the very fact of His dying for her, she was authorized to take up the exclamation of Paul and to say, "The Son of God loved *me* and gave himself for *me*." The view she obtained of a Saviour who had loved her and who was loving her still, dissipated her terrors, and, like the Ethiopian eunuch, she went from us on her way rejoicing. How soothing and morally powerful are the most scriptural words of Luther—"The Son of God loved me and gave himself for me. It was not I then that first loved the Son of God, and delivered myself for him. Who is that 'me?' Even I, wretched and damnable sinner, so dearly beloved by the Son of God, who gave himself for me." For Christ, when he cometh, is nothing else but joy and sweetness to a trembling and broken heart, as here Paul witnesseth, who setteth him out with this most sweet and comfortable title when he saith "which loved me and gave himself for me." Read therefore with great vehemency these words "*me*" and "*for me*," and so inwardly practise with thyself, that thou with a sure faith mayest conceive and point this "me" in thy heart, and apply it unto thyself, not doubting but that *thou* art of the number of those to whom this "me" belongeth."—*On Galatians*, ii. 20 v.

3d. The Bible reveals that every sinner may now have forgiveness of all his sins, and know that they are remitted. Jesus, "who was wounded for our transgressions," has been exalted to give repentance unto Israel and the remission of sins. Jehovah now waits to be gracious to all who approach Him in the name of His Son Jesus. Consider for a moment this text "if we confess our sins he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness:" 1 John i. 9. What could be more encouraging and blissful to one who knows that he has sinned against his Maker? In the name of Jesus, seek for mercy and it shall be granted. "We *have* redemption through his blood, and the forgiveness of sins." And how, some one may inquire, am I to know when God has pardoned my offences? We answer, fulfill the condition and take God at his word. "Ask and ye shall receive;" supplicate pardon in the name of Jesus, and when you have done so, believe that your request is bestowed. In no other way have you any warrant to expect the assurance of mercy, or to be sure that you have found it; and is not the promise of God enough—a solid and immovable basis for you to stand upon and to rejoice? Some trust in dreams and impressions, and look for voices and signs of diverse order, but these are cheating phantoms, and can only mock the suppliant and dishonor your God. "Ask and ye shall receive," is an intimation plain to every understanding, and the reader is invited to prove the faithfulness of his God, and to honor Him by resting in His all-sufficient, written testimony. Having found mercy through the blood of the Lamb, the pardoned suppliant rejoices—his very being dilates with happiness—"Blessed is the man whose iniquity is forgiven, whose sin is covered." Possessing this mercy, the woman, who had been a sinner of no ordinary cast, "loved much," and in lowly gratitude washed the Saviour's feet with her tears, and wiped them with the hairs of her head; having the same precious boon, you will feel an impulse to honor the Redeemer and to run in the way of his precepts. The Lord "taketh pleasure in them that hope in His mercy."

4th. The Bible reveals God as pledged to provide for the temporal necessities of his people. "Seek ye *first* the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and *all these things* shall be added unto you." Matt. vi. 33. "He will withhold no good thing from them that walk uprightly." Ps. 84, 4 v. In serving God in a world like this, and in keeping a conscience void of offence, a man may often have occasion to risk his temporal resources, yea, as many have done, to resign them without any earthly prospect of providing for his necessities, and for those of others dependent on him. We have known individuals relinquish a business which their conscience, enlightened by scripture, condemned; we have known others testify for truth, and suffer in consequence reduction from competence to what is commonly called poverty, and yet they were sustained in their trials, and provided for by a promise-keeping God. Thus He animated them to a "patient continuance in well doing," when temptations were strong to give up their integrity and loyalty to truth and heaven. They were not put to shame, and, confiding in God, what could disappoint their bible-warranted expectations? He is faithful that promised: "heaven and earth may fail, but Jehovah's word cannot." Backed by the divine promises, who may not be strong? Who may not set his face like a flint? Who may not fight the good fight and lay hold of eternal life?

5th. The hope of incorruptible being and celestial glory in the new Jerusalem is a powerful motive to continue in well doing. In a little the wicked shall not be—they will be consigned to the depths of perpetual oblivion; but the redeemed ones shall live and reign through eternal ages, beholding the unveiled wonders of Deity, and drinking at the fountains of perennial happiness. A little while and these trials will be over; a little while and the crown will be gained, the shadows will be fled, and then purest light and purest love!

By these and kindred moral and spiritual influences, the God of infinite love is now inclining men to enter on the path of holiness, and to hurry along it, strangers and pilgrims in the earth. Let us yield ourselves to them fully and at once, and we shall find a strength and a happiness with which the Christless are necessarily unacquainted. As we write, the warm sun of spring is shining sweetly on the face of creation; we hear the singing of birds, and can see the opening buds and flowers. The winter is over and gone, and the kindly influences of the stars of day, coming up from dispensing his bounty in more southern climes, are augmenting their energy, and the beauties and blessings of nature are evolving and preparing already on every hand. Fair and apt emblem of his moral condition on whom the God of boundless, exhaustless love radiates his warming, quickening, beautifying rays through the great Mediator and Revealer. Come, then, within the full

stream of the love-influence, and you will have a blessed consciousness of strength and fire imparted to your moral nature. This hiding of God, which is so common in our day, is blasting the world, and paralyzing the church, and ought to be deplored in tears and sighs and groans. The truth about the Divine compassion for men, and the destiny he wishes them to climb to through faith, suffering and obedience, ought to be proclaimed with a voice of thunder, and yet in tones winning as an angel's, till the slumbering, deluded tribes of man wake from their insensibility to the perception in Him of all that can ravish and invigorate and fortify a helpless creature. *Love is Power*, and "*God is Love.*"

## LIFE IN CHRIST.

BY EDWARD WHITE, ENGLAND.

[*Continued from page* 54.]

### Testimony of the Old Testament on the Punishment of the Wicked.

It has already been observed, that if the scripture doctrine on the human constitution be, that God created man with an imperishable spirit, it is probable, all things considered, that so grand a fundamental truth would present itself throughout the bible in perpetual allusions, and frequently in open declarations, just as the primitive rocks of the world are widely protruded through the over-lying strata.

And if it were reasonable to anticipate such allusions and declarations in one part of Holy Scripture rather than in another, it surely would be in that earlier series of revelations, which were evidently sent into the world to prepare it for the reception of Christianity. For, as we find a complicated and elaborate machinery set on foot in order to accustom the minds of men to the ideas of priesthood and sacrifice, so we might expect to discover an equally labored attempt to bring forth into strong relief that preliminary doctrine of Immortality, on which, it is asserted, the whole revelation is founded.

A candid reader, however, must assuredly admit, that the Old Testament Scriptures are strikingly destitute of any such abstract doctrine of human immortality; so much so, indeed, as to have led some persons to assert, that it was the gospel revelation which first brought the fact of man's eternity into public notice; and some others, such as Warburton, and the ancient Sadducees, to doubt the existence therein of any hope of a resurrection or life, even for the pious. This remarkable silence in the Old Testament, we have already assumed to be a solid argument against the truth of the common doctrines, and of the consequences which necessarily flow from them: but let us now further inquire, whether the statements of the Old Testament writings do not rather agree with the theory which has been propounded for examination; whether they do not studiously hold forth final and eternal destruction of the wicked, in opposition to the notion of their everlasting existence. The circumstance, that we have found these writings so explicit in the matter of everlasting rewards, should prepare us to expect an equal clearness in their representations upon retribution.

Dr. Horberry, one of the most strenuous advocates of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul of all men, admits that "the Old Testament has *nothing* so clear and express upon this subject as the New," (intending, doubtless, "nothing so clear as he imagined he could discover in the New;" but, as less critical writers are not equally frank upon this important point, it is necessary to examine two or three texts, which are alleged to indicate the eternal life and suffering of the wicked.

The words of Isaiah, ch. xxxiii. 14, are presumed to refer to the everlasting existence of the wicked in the fires of hell. "The sinners in Zion are afraid; fearfulness hath surprised the hypocrites. Who among us shall dwell with the devouring fire? who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings?"

With a view to ascertain the true meaning of the words of the prophet, we may mention that Dr. Boothroyd translates the passage thus: "The sinners in Zion are filled with dread. Terror hath seized the profligate. Who among us can abide consuming fire? who among us can abide perpetual burnings?" A careful attention to the context will show, that the chapter whence these words are taken refers to the desolating invasion of Sennacherib, in the age of Hezekiah and the prophet Isaiah, sent as a punishment for the sins of the people. On this point the the commentators are agreed. Viewed in this connection, the words of the text appear to have not even the most remote reference to future punishment in the other world; but were intended to represent the exclamation of the sinners of Zion, who rightly feared that the "continual conflagrations" of war, the devastations of fire and sword which the invader caused, would terminate in their *destruction;* for who, said they, *can* dwell in these perpetual burnings? In the 13th verse the Lord thus addresses them: "Now will I arise, now will I lift up myself, now will I be exalted. Ye conceive chaff, and bring forth stubble, and my spirit like fire *shall consume you.* And the people shall be burned as lime: *as thorns cut up they shall be consumed in the fire.*" Then follows the text, "Who among us *shall abide* consuming fire? who among us shall abide perpetual burnings?" And it is quite obvious, that these perpetual burnings are ths same with those mentioned above:—but they were the flames of war kindled at God's command by Sennacherib, the effect of which was to consume the people utterly, as thorns are burnt up in a lime-kiln.

The other passage sometimes adduced with a similar view, is found in Daniel xii. 2: "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake; some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." From this last expression it is argued, that the wicked will awake to *an everlasting sense* and consciousness of the everlasting contempt. That this, however, is an unreasonable inference, will appear from the reflection that since the other class, the blessed, arise to everlasting *life*; these may be considered as arising to undergo the infliction of eternal *death*. A still more formidable obstacle to the conclusion proposed is, however, presented by the circumstance that the prophet Isaiah, two hundred years previously, had employed the same term (*deraion*, contempt, ch. lxvi. verse 24, there translated, *abhorring,*) when speaking of the fate of the wicked, but most pointedly had referred to them as reduced to *carcases*, (*phagarim*, translated *dead corpses* in 2 Kings xix. 37,) their "worm dying not," and their funeral fires still smouldering on. If therefore, Isaiah uses the word "contempt" or "abhorring" in reference to lifeless carcases, it may be, that Daniel, also, intended to signify, that many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, and come forth to the resurrection of a literal des-

truction, becoming thereafter the putrescent objects of disgust to the universe.

With the exception of the two passages just examined, (of which, one does not really refer to future punishment, and the other, when properly understood, is found to harmonize with the interpretation proposed,) it is admitted that the *entire mass* of Old Testament phraseology has nothing very clear and express in favour of the doctrine of the immortality of the wicked, but is of a character which might exceedingly well denote the idea of their literal destruction.

It is nevertheless to be observed, that, from the most ancient times, it seems to have been understood that there would be a day of judgment for transgressors; a prospect which must necessarily have been associated with the idea of the *resurrection* of the unjust. The prophecy of Enoch, the seventh from Adam, recorded by the Apostle Jude, contains clear intimations, that God left not himself without witness in relation to this awful subject, in the earliest ages. Two passages likewise already noticed, (not to mention any others,) plainly declare that the wicked shall come forth, to endure the divine vengeance, from their graves. Isaiah tells us, that the "*earth shall cast out the Rephaim,*" the wicked; and Daniel, in the passage just commented upon, says, that they "shall awake *from the dust of the earth* to shame and everlasting contempt."

The doctrine of the resurrection of the wicked, however, as in the New Testament, so in the Old, is almost lost amidst those thick and black clouds of divine anger, which menace them with *destruction, excision* and *death.* The language of every writer in succession points to the same conclusion.

1. MOSES. We have the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ for understanding the promise of *life* made to the obedient servants of God, by the great Legislator, as pointing on to life eternal; for when the young Ruler inquired what good thing he should do to have eternal life, the Saviour referred him to the Law, with its promise of *life* to the genuine Israelite. But this decision obliges us to conclude, that the *threatenings* of the Law are to be understood likewise with a reference to the greater penalties of the future world. Amongst these threatenings, that which most frequently occurs is—that the offender shall be *cut off.* It is this threatening, moreover, which is appended, as a sanction of obedience, to the promise of a "Prophet like unto Moses"—a promise quoted by Peter as having received its fulfilment in Jesus. Acts iii. 23: "A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whasotever he shall say unto you. And it shall come to pass, that every soul, which will not hear that prophet, shall be *destroyed from amongst the people.*" Now, if this threatening be to be understood in the sense of *everlasting torments* in this place, it must assuredly signify the same thing wherever it is used, (otherwise, a most arbitrary principle of interpretation will supervene,) and then the consequence will follow, that *eating leaven* is threatened with the infliction of interminable agonies in hell; for the same menace occurs, appended to the injunction against that offence. (Exod. xii. 15.) But if it be felt that, in this instance, such a sense cannot warrantably be affixed to the words, but that they must be understood of *literal death,* by lapidation or by burning, we are obliged to suppose, that such likewise must be the signification of the threatening of *karat,* or excision, wherever it appears. The ordinary menaces of the Mosaic law are couched in these terms, *death, destruction, cutting off, loss of life;* and there is an uniform remarkable abstinence from any expression which would seem to promise a "lengthening of days" to the enemies of God. This is so much the case, that less careful readers of these earliest writings have even determined (contrary to the declarations of the Lord Jesus,) that they contained no intimations even *of an eternal reward for the servants of the Most High.*

Now we must be permitted to express the conviction, that it is unspeakably strange and mysterious, if men of all ages, and therefore the Jews, to whom Moses wrote, have possessed immortal souls, and have been on a probation for the alternative of existence forever, either in blessedness or in agony, that no single intimation should appear in the Pentateuch, which contains *the gospel* preached unto Abraham, of such a constitution of things. Especially is it mysterious, if the law of Moses was, as the Apostle declares, a repetition, or re-entrance, of God's eternal law in its immutable principles, and if the curse of that eternal law was, as is asserted by most, everlasting misery in hell, that not one individual term can be found in the long, and varied, and awfully eloquent catalogue of Mosaic denunciations, capable of bearing any other signification than a literal destruction of humanity in the case of the wicked.

2. An equally striking silence upon the endless duration of the lives of theungodly characterizes the Book of Job. This most ancient poem contains frequent and animated references to the punishment of the wicked; and being composed in the lofty style of the orientals, we might anticipate amplification in the detail, and a copious vocabulary of language, pervading those portions which describe the doom of transgressors. For it is not the genius of oriental speech to compress infinite ideas into tame and inadequate expressions, with a Spartan sententiousness, but rather to exalt and to magnify inferior thoughts by an excessive and unrestrained employement of exaggeration and metaphor. And, ysurel, if such a conception as that of *everlasting existence in misery* were intended to be conveyed in the style of Eastern poetry, it would find its natural and appropriate vehicle in the tremendous inflations of the Koran, and not in the brief declarations of this most ancient composition. He who could speak so eloquently of tho woes of a mortal, would certainly have risen even above the gloomy sublimity of the style of Æschylus, when contemplating the sufferings of an Immortal. The following, however, are examples of the threatenings held out, in the book of Job, to the enemies of God:

Chap. xviii.—"The light of the wicked shall be put out, and the spark of his fire shall not shine. His strength shall be hunger-bitten, and destruction shall be ready at his side. It shall devour the strength of his skin: even the first-boru of death shall devour his strength. His confidence shall be rooted out of his tabernacle, and it shall bring him to the king of terrors. It shall dwell in his tabernacle, because it is none of his: brimstone shall be scattered upon his habitation. His roots shall be dried up beneath, and above shall his branch be cut off. His remembrance shall perish from the earth, and he shall have no name in the street. He shall be driven from light into darkness, and chased out of the world."

Chap. xx.—"Knowest thou not this of old, since man was placed upon the earth, that the triumphing of the wicked is short, and the joy of the hypocrite but for a moment? Though his excellency mount up to the heavens, and his head reach unto the clouds; yet shall he perish forever like his own dung: they

which have seen him shall say, Where is he? He shall fly away as a dream, and shall not be found: yea, he shall be chased away as a vision of the night. The eye also which saw him shall see him no more; neither shall his place any more behold him."

Chap. xxi.—"How oft is the candle of the wicked put out? and how oft cometh their destruction upon them? His eyes shall see his destruction, and he shall drink of the wrath of the Almighty."

3. The Book of Psalms may be supposed to represent the popular belief during the best instructed ages of the Jewish commonwealth. The menaces of vengeance to the ungodly found in this collection of sacred songs, are as follows:

Psalm i.—"The ungodly are not so: they are like the chaff, which the wind driveth away. The Lord knoweth the way of the righteous: but the way of the ungodly shall *perish.*"

Psalm ii.—"Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt *dash them in pieces* like a potter's vessel. Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and he *perish* from the way."

Psalm ix.—"Thou hast rebuked the heathen, thou hast destroyed the wicked: thou hast put out their name forever and ever. The wicked shall be turned into *sheol*, (the state of death,) and all the nations that forget God."

Psalm xi.—"Upon the wicked he shall rain snares (or destructions,) fire and brimstone, and an horrible tempest: this shall be the portion of their cup."

Psalm xxxiv.—"The face of the Lord is against them that do evil, to cut off the remembrance of them from the earth. Evil *shall slay the wicked:* and they that hate the righteous shall be desolate."

Psalm xxxv.—"Let destruction come upon them unawares; and let his net that he hath hid catch himself: into that very destruction let him fall."

Psalm xxxvii.—"Fret not thyself because of evil-doers, neither be thou envious at the workers of iniquity For they shall soon be *cut down like the grass*, and wither like the green herb. For evil-doers shall be cut off: but those that wait upon the Lord, they shall inherit the earth. (See Matt. v. 5.) For yet a little while, and the wicked shall not be: yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place, and it shall not be. The wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs; they shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away. For such as be blessed of God shall inherit the earth; but they that be cursed of him shall be cut off. I have seen the wicked in great power, and spreading himself like the green bay tree. Yet he passed away, and, lo, he was not: yea, I sought him, but he could not be found. Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright: for the end of that man is peace. But the transgressors shall be destroyed together: the end of the wicked shall be cut off."

Psalm xlix.—"Man that is in honor, and understandeth not, is like the beasts that perish."

Psalm xcii.—"O Lord, how great are thy works! and thy thoughts are very deep. A brutish man knoweth not; neither doth a fool understand this. When the wicked spring as the grass, and all the workers of iniquity do flourish; it is *that they may be destroyed forever.* (*Lehishamadam*, the word used in Gen. xxxiv. 30. Levit. xxvi. 30. Numb. xxxiii. 52. Deut. i. 27.) For, lo, thy enemies, O Lord, for, lo, thy enemies shall perish, all the workers of iniquity shall be scattered."

Psalm cxii.—"The horn of the righteous shall be exalted with honor. The wicked shall see it and be grieved; he shall *gnash with his teeth and melt away.*" (See Matt. xiii. 50. "There shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth.")

The wisdom of Solomon dictated expressions on this subject, in exact conformity with the declarations of David.

Prov. x. 24.—"The fear of the wicked, it shall come upon him: but the desire of the righteous shall be granted. As the whirlwind passeth, so is the wicked no more: but the righteous hath an everlasting foundation. The fear of the Lord prolongeth days: but the years of the wicked shall be shortened. The hope of the righteous shall be gladness: but the expectation of the wicked shall perish. The way of the Lord is strength to the upright: but destruction shall be to the workers of iniquity. The righteous shall never be removed: but the wicked shall not inhabit the earth."

Prov. xiii. 13.—"Whoso despiseth the word shall be destroyed: but he that feareth the commandmant shall be rewarded. The law of the wise is a fountain of life, to depart from the snares of death."

Prov. xiv. 12.—"There is a way which seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death."

Prov. xv. 24.—"The way of life is above (an upward road) to the wise to depart from *Sheol* (the state of death) beneath."

Prov. xxi. 16.—"The man that wandereth out of the way of understanding shall remain in the congregation of the dead." *Rephaim*—Heb.

After the above copious citations, it is unnecessary to do more than refer to the general style in which the holy Prophets denounce God's judgments to the ungodly. Their words are *uniformly* to the effect, that the sinner shall be destroyed, shall be consumed, shall die, perish, or be slain.

The 18th chapter of Ezekiel's prophecies contains a fair example of the prophetical mode of address on this subject. "Behold, all souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so the soul of the son is mine. *The soul that sinneth, it shall die.* Have I any pleasure that the wicked should die? saith the Lord God, and not that he should return from his ways and live?" "For when the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness which he hath committed, and doeth that which is lawful and right, he *shall save his soul alive;* because he considereth, he shall surely live, he shall not die. For I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord God; wherefore turn yourselves, and live ye!"

The last threatening in the Old Testament (Malachi iv.) may likewise be adduced as an average representation of the whole current of phraseology in the Prophets, and may serve to indicate the degree to which God's ancient messengers encouraged the wicked to reckon upon an everlasting existence. "For, behold, the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; and the proud, and all that do wickedly, shall be as stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, that *it shall leave them neither root nor branch.*"

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

———o———

THE SECOND Number of the Christian Truth-Seeker will be issued about the middle of this month. For the terms, see last page of the Examiner. The Truth-Seeker is a neat folio of four pages, five columns to a page. Two or three columns will be appropriated to advertisements, sometimes. Will our friends do what they can for its circulation. We doubt not it will be found an interesting paper.

———o———

PREACHING every Lord's day, by the Editor of the Examiner, when at home, in the Hall, Northwest corner of Sixth and Callowhill streets.

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, MAY, 1851.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—Our friends will see that we have much increased the amount of matter in the Examiner, by using smaller type; though smaller, it is a better type than previously used. We think our patrons will be satisfied that we intend they shall have the worth of the money they pay for the paper. Will they try to increase its circulation? No subscription received for a less time than one volume.

———o———

POSTAGE ON THE BIBLE EXAMINER, under the *new Postage Law*, to take effect in July next:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Under 50 miles, for 3 mos., | 1¼ cts, | or 5 cts. pr. year. |
| Over 50 miles and under 300, | 2½ " | 10 " " |
| Over 300 " " 1000, | 3¾ " | 15 " " |
| Over 1000 " " 2000, | 5 " | 20 " " |
| Over 2000 " " 4000, | 6¼ " | 25 " " |

It will be seen that to our subscribers, under 1000 miles, the postage is less than by the old law; whilst over 1000 and under 2000 miles, it is increased *two* cents in the year. This increase of postage will affect only a few of them, and to such the diminished postage on their remittance to the Examiner, from *ten* cents to *three*, will still make them a saving from the present rates. On the Examiner the subscribers will, after July 1st, have to pay the foregoing rates at their respective Post Offices, three months in advance.

Postage on letters any distance, where we have subscribers, under the new law, will be *three* cents if *pre-paid*, or *five* if left for us to pay. Economy, therefore, suggests the pre-payment in all cases; but use Post Office *stamps* always, when you can get them. Where this is not done it sometimes happens that by the carelessness of Post Offices, or otherwise, letters are not *stamped paid* when actually pre-paid, and we are compelled to pay again. We have no doubt a number of such cases have occurred.

———o———

REMOVAL.—Since our last we have removed our residence and office from 198 Marshall street to 68 North Eighth street. By this removal we are situated where our friends, who visit this city, can easily call on us, and we shall be happy to see them.

———o———

WM. GLEN MONCRIEFF, Scotland, has furnished an excellent article for the Examiner, founded on Rom. 2: 7. Let not its length deter any, but let it be carefully read by all; it will richly repay you for the labor. He will please accept our thanks for it, and we hope he will continue his favors. In his private note, accompanying the article, he says:—"I would have written you sooner, but in November last, my right foot was amputated above the ankle joint, and for a while I could do little." He adds, "My health is greatly improved, and I hope ere long to be able to walk and work abroad in the great cause. I can now preach three times every Lord's day, and good is doing, and the Life doctrine spreading, and spreading savingly. I have thus, in many ways, reason to bless God for his loving kindness, sparing and restoring mercy. The Examiner comes duly, and I am grateful to you for your kindness."

Those in Scotland who wish to subscribe for the Bible Examiner, are informed that the subscription price in British coin, per annum, is four shillings and sixpence, and we have to *pre-pay* the postage on the papers, which is a fraction over one shilling more per annum. The money can be remitted to us by a draft on Browns & Bowen, Philadelphia; or, on Browns & Brothers, New York. We can still furnish the Examiner from the commencement of 1848, if desired. Brother Moncrieff is fully authorised to act as agent for us.

We are sorry to learn of his affliction in the loss of a foot, but are glad to hear that he is doing well and likely to do efficient service in Scotland for the truth of God. May the Lord make him indeed a polished shaft in His glorious work and service.

———o———

FROM H. H. DOBNEY.—The following letter from Bro. Dobney is one of deep interest to us; and though probably designed as a *private* communication, we cannot refrain from giving it a place in the Examiner, as we know everything from England and Scotland, from those whose hearts are alive to the great truth of "Life and Immortality *only* in Christ," is full of interest to the readers of our paper. We hope our friends on the other side of the Atlantic will favor us often with communications for our columns. We are happy to give them a place.

MAIDSTONE, England, Feb. 25, 1851.

*My dear Brother:*—I have many things to thank you for, and had need mention them *seriatim*. First of all, there is now lying before me your very welcome and interesting *letter* of the 9th ultimo. With that came a copy of the New York "*Theological and Literary Journal*," for which I was the more indebted, as I had in vain tried to procure it in London, and so should not have seen it but for your kindness. And now comes the February No. of the "*Bible Examiner*," which of course is full of interest to me. I have also to thank you for offering to send me the numbers in which you reviewed Mr. Hinton's volume in reply to some four or five of us; and shall anticipate the pleasure of receiving them. And still, again, I have to acknowledge your courtesy in placing the columns of the Examiner at my disposal, for a review of Mr. Lord's article on my book. For all this, and more, I fear I must remain your debtor, and now tender you my very best thanks, not as, even in part, payment, but only as an acknowledgment of the obligation under which you laid me, and which it is by no means unpleasant to feel.

Mr. Lord's review is naturally the chief thing to

notice. But somewhat about reviews in general, first, if you will. At the commencement of the controversy, I used to look forward to the reviews of my book with the feelings of one anxious for truth, and quite ready to admit that the subject might receive greater elucidation from other thoughtful Christians than he had been capable of giving it. Only He who searches the heart can know the deep solicitude I felt, before publishing at all, not to be a means of error, and so of injury, to other minds. I think I could rather have suffered anything than be the agent in turning one individual out of the way of truth; and I should shrink from intimating any of the more marked forms which my intensity of feeling assumed in the solitude in which my book was written. But, unable to discover any flaw in the reasoning, and the more I pondered it myself, or submitted it to the consideration of others, becoming increasingly convinced that, whatever might ultimately be discovered to be the truth, the dogma of never-ending misery, as taught by most evangelical Christians, had no adequate support in either scripture or reason. I committed the results of my inquiry to the Lord, with many prayers that if my "argument" were not in harmony with the truth, He, in His good providence, would cause it to be speedily and completely confuted. I think I should rejoice as much as any one in seeing the truth on this solemn subject brought out so unmistakably as that the point might be considered settled once for all, for all candid and honest disciples of our common Master. Surely it is the truth alone that can benefit; and we should be not only knaves but fools if we were to continue to hug a doctrine, after misgivings had been reasonably excited, because we had publicly committed ourselves to its advocacy. Why, what is maintenance of our self-consistency (as the world reckons consistency) in comparison with the dear pleasure of following truth wherever it may lead? In this spirit, then, I used to watch for the reviews of my little work—eager for "conviction" if wrong—and willing to be even scourged back into the way of truth, if I had unwittingly abandoned it. But, alas for Christian candor and truthfulness!—for the most part, misrepresentation and malignant abuse constituted the staple of the earlier notices. The lately deceased Dr. Pye Smith (a man whom it would be simple impertinence in me to praise) wrote to Dr. Morrison, the editor of the Evangelical Magazine, remonstrating with him on the kind of notice he had given in his pages of my first publication, entitled "Notes of Lectures," and the venerable divine, writing to me soon afterwards on the subject, enclosed the "Evangelical" editor's award, which was indeed painfully indicative of the bitterness and haughtiness which are sometimes found in those who make pretensions of universal concern for evangelical piety. A phrase must suffice; speaking of myself and Mr. White, Dr. Morrison, after a good deal of angry contemptuousness, says, "These mushroom divines must be put down." *Sic!* From the Eclectic Review I received the courteous notice which might have been expected, and replied to the strictures in the work you have, "Scripture Doctrine," &c. But my friend Mr. White subsequently received but scurrilous treatment in the same periodical, his reviewer being Dr. Redford, of Worcester, who was not without personal feeling towards him, and who was not ashamed, as an anonymous critic, to vent his private anger in a public effusion of concern for the interests of truth! In the "Evangelical," also, Mr. White was treated with as much bitter disingenuousness as is ever met with in the angry strifes of the world. The writer was understood to be the late Dr. Payne, of Exeter.

The late Dr. Hamilton was engaged to deliver the "Congregational Lectures, one year, on "Future Rewards and Punishment." It was well understood *why* the subject was fixed on; but while the Dr. was delivering the course that was to set the question at rest which we had raised, he was here and there dropping the remark that he had not read what we had to say on the subject! A little before that, one of the editors of the "Patriot" newspaper, the organ of the Congregationalists, made a sort of apology to me for not having reviewed my book, frankly telling me they did not dare; for that, having recently noticed rather favorably Mr. White's volume, they had received several angry communications from men of eminence in the Independent body—among whom this very Dr. Hamilton! But the Dr. was a jovial gentleman, whose good-fellowship was not affected by the dogmas he taught. The editor of the Baptist Magazine, my predecessor in the pastoral here, has for many years held our views, but prides himself on great editorial propriety. and so has never noticed the book in our own periodical!

The treatment we received from some of the confessedly ablest men of the Evangelical body to which we ourselves were well known to belong, served very greatly to confirm me in the opinion I had avowed. For I reasonably thought the argument advanced had been subjected to the severest scrutiny, and while, here and there, a weak place or two had been discovered, and an occasionally unfortunate mode of conveying the intended meaning had been pounced upon and eagerly made the most of. the general argument itself seemed to me to remain untouched. Dr. Vaughan, editor of the British Quarterly Review, a Christian, a scholar, and a gentleman, gave an elaborate critique, in which he did himself the justice to disavow any sympathy with the spirit in which our views had been for the most part met, and argued the matter calmly and worthily. But whether it were from an undue bias or from any other unduly interfering influence, the review of the British Quarterly also appeared to me to avoid touching the core

of our argument. Of course, this may be mere prejudice on my part, though I am not aware of the existence of so disturbing an element.

I have allowed my pen to run on thus partly because it may be not without interest to you, and partly because it will lead you perhaps to anticipate that I feel no inclination to attempt a formal reply to my New York reviewer. Generally, it is not for an author to engage in the *duello* with his critics. He and they are both before the public, and I for one am not ambitious to have the last word; while I greatly deprecate the idea of an important controversy becoming disfigured by personalities.

Shall you consider me unduly apathetic to my own good name if I state that, for a long time, that name, as bandied to and fro in this discussion, is no more to me than a convenient Algebraic or other symbol? To my eye it stands just as the name Philalethes, or Theron, or any other assumed by an unknown author, and which had come to signify the doctrine maintained. Indeed, I can scarcely withhold the confession (at which you will smile) that so thoroughly have I succeeded in putting off my printed self from my present identity, that, if it would answer any good end, my present should go to buffet with my former self; and the amusing idea has somehow got into my head of even writing an antagonistic review myself of "Dobney on Future Punishment," for the sake of more thoroughly testing the "argument" than as yet it appears to me to have been tested. Of course, my friend will not so far misapprend this remark, as to consider me as, even in thought, trifling with the sacredness of truth. I make it merely to illustrate the greater concern I feel for the bringing out of the simple truth, than for any merely personal reputation.

Certainly the article in the New York Journal disappointed me, after the notice you had given of the eminent ability of the writer; although, in one respect, it was satisfactory to see that the reviewer did not in reality grapple with the argument as I have put it; but, (doubtless) unconsciously to himself, misrepresented before confuting it. I have hesitated to say as much as this, and have half a mind (you see I am not writing a formal letter to you, but merely chatting with a friend,) to draw the pen across it now it is written. However, as it simply states how the article appears to me, I say, with the ancient, though the name and circumstance are not happy, "*O gegrapha, gegrapha.*"—["What I have written, I have written."—Ed. Ex.]

I have made several notes on the article in question; but, over and above the uninteresting and even disagreeable task of trying to point out wherein you fancy a respondent has failed to do justice to your statements, and misapprehended your meaning, and given fallacious replies to your argument, by the time a paper from me could reach you, (for it is not written yet,) the interest felt in the review would probably have subsided. Your own notice of the article will suffice; and the issue, in a cheap form, of the second part of my volume, will constitute as good a reply as is needed, perhaps. Had I contemplated your publishing another edition, I think I might have been induced to propose that I should have carefully revised the argument, in which case it might have been possible advantageously to notice the stronger point of my respected Reviewer's critique. But, as I have said, I feel an almost invincible repugnance to personal controversy, and am very strongly disposed to let the question as already argued stand or fall by its own merits.

Had I not taken up nearly all my space, I would have suggested a few thoughts on another phase of the doctrine we cherish, and a fundamentally important one, viz: *The Spiritual Life Itself*, which all genuine disciples of Christ, without distinction, do derive from him, and which does indeed make them "new creatures," with the blessed instincts of immortality gloriously and increasingly asserting themselves within the soul. But I may hope for another opportunity of touching on this most important matter.

I need not say how happy I shall be to hear from you again. Your letter was exceedingly grateful to me, I do assure you. And wishing you every blessing, I am, Very faithfully, yours,

H. H. Dobney.

While we fully concur in the idea that the circulation of the work reviewed by Mr. Lord is a good reply to that review, we know it would be very satisfactory to many of our readers to have a direct reply from Mr. Dobney, if it is not taxing him too much to furnish it. Till then, however, let "*Dobney Abridged*," be widely circulated.

We shall be much gratified to receive, also, an article, or articles, on the topic of "*The Spiritual Life Itself*, which all genuine disciples of Christ draw from him," &c. Will Br. Dobney furnish such at his earliest convenience?—Ed. Ex.

———o———

Thoughts on Luke ix. 23 to 26.—We propose to give a brief exposition of these words of our Lord. We shall do it by showing the force of each principal word as it occurs in the original language.

V. 23.—"If any man"—*tis*—any one—"will"—*thelei*—desire to, or determine to—"come after me"—*elthein opiso*—to come behind; that is, to be a follower of, a disciple of; in other words, to be a learner or scholar of Christ. This is the grand characteristic of a real Christian. But to do this, "any one" must—"*will*"—determine to become such. "Let him *deny* himself"—*aparnesastho*—disown, disregard, *renounce* himself. *Self* is the god of all unregenerate men. Selfish purposes, objects, ends and aims, control all their thoughts, words and actions.

Self-aggrandisement, in some form, is the presiding and ruling passion, however apparently benevolent they may seem to be. Self-ease, self-honor, self-enjoyment and gratification rules them in all things. The requirements of God have no binding authority with them. They obey if it is convenient, popular, or will tend to their selfish ends; not, however, because God requires it of them.

Jesus requires, if any one determines to become his scholar, that he disown, disregard, renounce himself; because a man cannot learn of Christ and be acting on those selfish principles of which we have spoken. The spirit of this world, or of the men of this world, is in direct hostility to the self-sacrificing spirit of Jesus, whose heart ever overflowed with concern for the honor of God, abhorence of sin, and earnest effort, at any sacrifice, to deliver men from sin, or from dishonoring God, and from death. In this effort he encountered, withstood, and rebuked wicked men in high places as well as in low, whether in ecclesiastical bodies or in private life. This kept him constantly exposed to reproach and suffering, and at length brought upon him the hate of those whom he rebuked to that degree that they put him to the most shameful death. Here was renunciation of self; and if any one determine or desire to be a follower or scholar of Christ, let him make up his mind to renounce himself, so far as honor from men is concerned; and when told that "to join the church is the way to be *respectable*," be assured, such a church cannot be a church of Christ. Self-renunciation is an unalterable condition of discipleship of Christ. "Let him deny himself, and take up"—*arato*—bear, lift, raise, carry—"his cross"—*stauron*, a figurative expression, borrowed from the fact that criminals, to be put to death, were compelled to carry the wood or cross on which they were to be crucified. It signifies that he who determines to be a Christian must be ready to undergo the severest trials or sufferings—to expose himself to any danger, when called to it, for Christ and his cause: this is to be done "daily"—*emeran*—every day: i. e. constantly, continually; to be the constant habit of mind, and not merely the effect of short-lived excitement. He is to do this, and "follow"—*akoloutheito*—*imitate* Christ.

V. 24.—"Whosoever will"—*determines to*—"save"—*sosai*—preserve safe and unharmed—"his life"—now, in this present time: he who will not suffer with Jesus, if need be, even to death, but determines to preserve his life by abandoning Christ, his service, or truth—"shall lose it"—shall lose that life which Christ designs for his followers, viz: "*eternal ltfe.*" The original word for "lose it" is, *apolesei*, from *apo* and *alluo*, to kill, to destroy: they shall be destroyed, perish: not have life. "But whosoever will"—determines to—"lose his life"—to be killed, if need be; to count himself, or present life, of no value in comparison of Christ, his cause, and his truth: "for my sake"—*eneken*—on account of Christ—"the same shall save"—preserve it safe: that is, his life will be sure to him; for it is in Christ, and "when Christ who is *our life* shall appear, then shall "they also appear with him in glory;" even tho' they may have died in shame, as did their Lord.

V. 25.—"What is a man advantaged"—of what *service* is it—"if he gain"—acquire—"the whole world, and lose"—*apolesas*, perish, be *destroyed*—"*himself:*" or lose his being—his existence: "or be cast away;" too vile for preservation.

V. 26.—"For whosoever shall be ashamed of me"—shall shrink from owning Christ from fear of reproach, suffering, or death—"and of my words"—*logous*—sayings, testimony, or doctrine—"of him shall the Son of man be ashamed"—refuse to own as his disciple or follower—"when he shall come"—for he will come again—not to suffer and to be put to shame, but—"in his own glory"—the true and proper glory of King Messiah, to rule on his own throne, and over all the earth—"and in his Father's" glory, with that glory with which his Father has invested him, and which he has enjoyed on his Father's throne with all power in heaven and in earth. In that glory will he come the *second* time. How unlike his first appearing. To have him ashamed of us—to disown us then, how much more terrible than anything we can suffer in this present state, even if called now to suffer a like death to what Jesus did.

Let us, then, take heed to every word spoken in the language under consideration; and so lay it to heart that it may influence all our tempers, thoughts, words, and acts. Christ will soon return in that glory he here speaks of. Joyful day to those who have suffered with him, for him, and for his truth; then shall such be owned of him and enter on life eternal, and death never more have dominion over them: they shall "be glorified together" with Christ their Lord and head.

———o———

THE CONVENTION of the friends of Christian liberty, held in New York city on the 23d and 24th ult., was fully attended, and a spirit of uninterrupted harmony prevailed. Great was the consolation we experienced at that Convention, and it was fully demonstrated that the friends of Christ, holding different views on many points, could meet together in unity, even the unity of love and forbearance. Let the Lord have all the glory. We met numbers there whom we had never seen before, and united our heart with theirs in praise to our common Lord and Master, whose return to give *life and immortality* to his followers we believe is at hand.

Unexpectedly, we met at the Convention, Brother Richmond, whose "*noble stand*" we noticed in the last Examiner. He gave us the following note, written just as we were about parting. It will be read with interest:

BRO. STORRS:—Since I last wrote you, that which has befallen others for the truth sake; has come upon me. The Church of which I was a member, called a council of Ministers and others, *and without giving me the least notice of their movements, and in my absence, excluded me from their fellowship.* A few days after, the Clerk of the Church handed me the following letter:

"PERU, Ia., April 15, 1851.

"At a meeting of the Peru Baptist Church, convened on the 2d day of April, 1851, Eld. C. M. Richmond, with two other members, were excluded in consequence of sentiments entertained by them not deemed orthodox by the church, to wit:

1. *Man has not an immortal soul.*
2. *The dead are unconscious.*
3. *Endless pain is not the punishment for the violation of God's law.*
4. *The wicked do not receive their punishment, nor the righteous their reward immediately after death.*

A council of ministering brethren and others was held previous to the action of the church, who recommended a withdrawal of the hand of fellowship from all who held to the above views. The Christian walk and conversation of Eld. Richmond, while Pastor of the Church, so far as is known in this community, is exemplary and without blemish.

H. J. SHIRK, Church Clerk."

Thus I have been weighed in the balance and found wanting. Not, however, the balance of God's Truth, but *Baptist Orthodoxy.* "But none of these things move me." My way is clear. I must contend for the truth at any sacrifice. In my journey to this place, I found some excellent brethren in the ministry who are examining the subject of life only in Christ, and I hear of others who are inquiring, "What shall the end be of them who obey not the gospel." The good work of Truth is everywhere prevailing. I have no P. O. address at present. You shall hear from me again soon.

C. M. RICHMOND.

## IMMORTALITY.

BY CHARLES FITCH.

Who has immortality?

1 Tim. 6: 13, 16—"I give thee charge in the sight of God, who quickeneth all things, and before Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession, *that thou keep this commandment* without spot, unrebukable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, which, in his times, he shall show, the blessed and only Potentate, King of Kings; and Lord of Lords, *who only hath immortality.*"

What commandment was Timothy thus charged to keep?

It was to flee the love of money, "follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness. Fight the good fight of faith, *lay hold on eternal life.*" See vs. 6 to 13.

Now, since it is true that Christ only, hath immortality, it cannot be true that men are immortal? I know it is assumed that while the bodies of men are mortal, their souls are immortal; but if this were so, then the Bible instead of saying that Christ only hath immortality, would have read that all mankind have immortality.

But that men have not immortality is perfectly manifest from what God said to Adam after he had sinned—"Dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return."

But it will, perhaps, be said that Adam was immortal notwithstanding what God declared. But that is mere assumption. Why did not God say, an immortal spirit thou art and thou canst never die? Obviously the reason why God did not say it was because it was not the fact. "Thou art dust, and unto dust shalt thou return." To say then that man is an immortal being, when God says he is dust, and shall return to dust, is to be wiser than God.

Besides, we learn from Gen. 3: 22, 24, that God drove man out of the garden of Eden, and placed at the east of the garden cherubims and a flaming sword turning every way, to keep the tree of life, lest man should take of it and eat, and live forever.

Man, therefore, lost immortality by the fall. In Gen. 5, 3, we read that Adam begat in his own likeness. As he was dust, his posterity were dust. Such is the Divine testimony. Ps. 78: 39—"for he remembered that they were but flesh, a wind that passeth away and cometh not again." Ps. 103: 14: "For he knoweth our frame, He remembereth that we are dust." Eccl. 3: 20—"All are of the dust, and all turn to dust again." I know it will be said in contradiction to this plain Bible testimony, that though man's body is dust, he has an immortal soul. But such a declaration as that cannot be found in the Bible. The word soul sometimes means life, and is applied to other existences as well as man. Thus when we read in the first chapter of Genesis of "every moving creature that hath *life;*" it is translated in the margin, "every creeping creature that hath soul." We read in the 12th chapter of Genesis, that when Abraham went down into Egypt, fearing that he might be slain on account of his wife, he said to her, "say thou art my sister, and my *soul* shall live because of thee." That is, my life shall be spared. In Isa. 29: 8, we read, "It shall even be as when a hungry man dreameth, and behold he eateth, but he awaketh and his *soul* is empty." In Rev. 16: 3, we read, "that the second angel poured out his vial upon the sea; and it became as the blood of a dead man, and every living *soul* died in the sea." That is, everything that had life.

The word soul is also used to mean a person. See 4th, 5th and 6th chapters of Leviticus: "If a soul sin;"

"if a soul swear;" "if a so l commit trespass;" "if a soul die," "if a soul touch any unclean thing." Thus the word soul means the life, the person, the being. But immortal soul is a term the Bible never uses. The word immortal is not found in the Bible but once, and that is in 1 Tim. 1: 17, "Now unto the King eternal, *immortal*, invisible; the only wise God, be honor and glory forever and ever. Amen." It is, therefore, a matter of absolute certainty that the Bible ascribes immortality to God and Jesus Christ only, and that man being dust, and returning to dust, does not possess immortality.

Besides, the gospel teaches man how to gain immortality, and this is positive proof that he does not now possess it. It would be strange indeed to instruct a man how to gain what he already possessed. I will, therefore, show from the scriptures of truth how immortality is to be gained.

But I shall first remark that there are two Greek words in the original of the New Testament, which are translated immortality. One is the word Athanasia; this is used in 1 Timothy 6: 16, ascribing immortality to Christ, "who only hath immortality." It is used again in 1 Cor. 15: 53: "And this mortal must put on immortality." Again, in the next verse, "So when this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, death is swallowed up in victory." Immortality therefore is to be put on in the resurrection, and it is therefore idle to say that any man is immortal until that time at least. The word Athanasia expressive of the immortality of Christ, is used in these three instances only in the New Testament. There is another word which is also translated immortality in some instances, and in some instances incorruption.

It is used in 2 Tim. 1: 10; "But is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death and brought life and *immortality* to light through the gospel." The Greek word here used is Aphtharsia, and is defined immortality, incorruptibility. It is used in Romans 2: 7: "To them who by a patient continuance in well doing seek for glory, honor and immortality, eternal life."

Immortality is, therefore, brought to light through the gospel, and is to be conferred on those who, through faith in the gospel, seek it by patient continuance in well doing. Immortality will, therefore, never be the portion of the wicked. The same Greek word is used in the following instances in the 15th chapter of 1 Cor. 42 verse: "It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption." Aphtharsia. 50th vs: "Now this I say, brethren that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." Corruptible man, then, is not immortal. 53d verse—"For this corruptible must put on incorruption, (Aphtharsia,) and this mortal must put on immortality, (Athanasia.) So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, (Aphtharsia,) and this mortal shall have put on immortality, (Athanasia,) then shall be brought to pass the saying which is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. Man, then, has no immortality till he puts it on in the resurrection. To say so is to turn infidels, because it is denying the plain testimony of God. The word Aphtharsia is used but once more in the New Testament. Ephesians 6: 24: "Grace be with all them who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity," or, with incorruption.

But will all mankind put on immortality in the resurrection? Let the Bible answer.

Gallatians 6: 7–8—"Be not deceived; God is not mocked; whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to the flesh, shall of the flesh reap CORRUPTION." Greek, Pithoran; defined thus: corruption, contagion, pestilence, mortality. Such is the harvest the wicked must reap. "But he that soweth to the spirit, shall of the spirit reap life everlasting." As surely, therefore, as the righteous reap eternal life, the wicked will reap mortality and not immortality—Luke 20: 35—36; "But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and THE RESURRECTION FROM THE DEAD, neither marry nor are given in marriage; neither can they die any more, for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being children of the resurrection." There will be those, therefore, who will attain to a resurrection, after which they cannot die any more."

Will there be those who can die more?"

Revelation 20: 6—"Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection, on such the second death hath no power." There is, therefore, a second death; how will it be executed? Revelation 21: 8—"But the fearful, and the unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars shall have their part in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the SECOND DEATH." We learn, therefore, from the 20th and 21st chapters of the Revelation, that there is a first and second resurrection, between which a thousand years are to intervene. That those who have part in the first resurrection are blessed and holy, and not exposed to the second death. Or, as our Saviour said, they that are accounted worthy to attain that world and the resurrection from the dead cannot die any more. But we also learn that those who have no part in the first resurrection live not until the thousand years are finished, and are then devoured. They have their part in the second death; and Peter tells us that "as natural brute beasts made to be taken and destroyed," they "shall utterly perish in their own corruption." 2 Peter 2: 12. Hence, they "reap corruption," and not immortality.

I can now understand the secret of Paul's great anxiety to attain to the resurrection from the dead.

In the 3d chapter of the Epistle to the Philippians, 7th verse, he writes thus, after having spoken of all his advantages as a Jew and a Pharisee: "But what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ; yea, doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord; for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung that I may win Christ, and be found in him, not having mine own righteousness which is of the law, but that which is of the faith of Christ, even the righteousness which is of God by faith, that I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death, if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection from the dead."

Through sufferings and death, therefore, Paul would follow Christ, if by any means he might attain to the first resurrection, and thus escape the second death. "Not (said he) as though I had already attained, either were already perfect." Paul knew that "the Captain of his Salvation was made perfect through sufferings." He would, therefore, "bear about in his body the dying of the Lord Jesus; and fill up in his flesh what remained of the sufferings of Christ, for his body's sake, which is the church." Like his master, therefore, Paul was made perfect through sufferings, and died at last a martyr for Christ, and will attain to the first resurrection—inasmuch as Christ cannot fail to fulfil to him the promise, "he that loseth his life for my sake shall keep it unto life eternal."

But I wish to show still more definitely, the way by which immortality is to be gained.

Christ said to Martha—John 11: 25—"I am the resurrection and the life. He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believe in me shall never die."

All therefore who die in the faith will be raised when "the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout and with the voice of the arch-angel, and with the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first." Then also those at that time living and believing in Christ shall in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, be changed to immortality and caught up to meet the Lord, and such will never die, as Christ said. We therefore read respecting Christ, John 1: 4, "In Him was LIFE, and the life was the light of men," John 3: 14; "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life." Hence, all who believe not in Christ for life, must perish, must suffer the second death. See 20th and 21st chapters of Revelation.

How exceedingly great and precious, therefore, are the words of our Saviour, John 6: 33, "For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven and giveth LIFE to the world." 40; "And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son and believeth on him, may have everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day."

Remember, therefore, reader, that you have no immortality but in Christ—and to gain it, you are to seek it through faith in him, and by patient continuance in well doing. All others will reap corruption in the second death, and in the lake of fire and brimstone be "utterly consumed with terror." There is no truth more plainly taught in the Bible than this, that there is no immortality for the wicked. The terms everlasting, eternal, &c., applied to the duration of their suffering, show that as long as they exist, they will exist to suffer; but since the Bible, aside from these terms, proves that they have no immortality, we come to the full conclusion that "the wages of sin is death" —that "all the wicked will God destroy," that they shall be utterly consumed with terrors." Sinner, if you will escape that doom, make haste to Christ.

———o———

FROM JOHN W. YEATS.

SAINT LOUIS, MO., March 2, 1851.

*Bro. Storrs:*—I have been a member of the Methodist Church since April 1844, and of course a believer in the immortality of the soul as held by them. When I became acquainted with Br. Battersby, about eighteen months ago, I was in connection with the Methodist Protestant Church, and as our numbers were small, he soon became quite intimate with all of us, particularly with myself and other members of my family. When he first spoke of the subject of immortality through Jesus Christ *alone*, and death to all who rejected the Saviour, I was much surprised, as it was a subject I had never heard of before. O! how strange it is that one who had read the Bible entirely through a number of times, should not have discovered the truth when it is so plainly set forth; but so it was. However, when Br. Battersby first spoke to me on the subject, it made a deep impression on my mind. I took up the word of God and began to search, asking the guidance of that Being who giveth to all, who seek, liberally. The result has been, after a prayerful investigation, that the glorious truth of Life through Christ alone, has made me free; and this night I can testify that my views of religion and the purposes of God concerning man are bright and clear; and, so far as I am concerned, I feel the sanctifying power of the truth of God to a greater extent than ever I did before in my life. Praise the Lord. I am thankful that I not only rejoice in the truth, but my wife is also set free, together with several of our other friends. O! I feel to rejoice in the truth, and so far as we can, we will endeavor to set the same truth before others. We have endeavored to procure

subscribers to your excellent paper, and will continue our efforts to that end, believing that if the people had the truth presented to them, divested of creed and party, many would be brought to see it as it is in Christ. And now, brother, if it should turn out that you visit the West, come to St. Louis, if you can, where you would receive a welcome from a few who are waiting for the glorious appearing of the Son of God.

———o———

FROM R. R. YORK.

*Bro. Storrs:*—I love to read the Examiner, for I do believe you have the truth in regard to the subject of "Life and Death," and it is encouraging to find any of sufficient courage and grace to speak out the whole truth in these times of peril when so many have "turned away their ears from the truth unto fables." O! what harmony is seen in the Bible when we look at its teachings in their true common sense light.

May the Lord help you to *speak* out and *live* out that faith that takes God at his word, and goes against "all lying spirits," whether they "speak, knock, or rap."

Allow me to suggest a question which I proposed to a Baptist not long since. It may be used by you to advantage, perhaps.

If infants go to heaven at death, or are in a state of consciousness, and continue to increase in knowledge till the resurrection, how can it be possible for their infantile bodies to be suited to minds or spirits that have been expanding for ages, and of course must be far beyond the greatest intellect that ever lived on the earth?

The above is the substance of what I wish to present. The form of it may be objectionable. If it is worth anything, use it, as I have never seen or heard this question presented before that I know of.

Your brother, looking for eternal life at the coming of Christ.

*Yarmouth, Me.*, 1851.

———o———

BR. J. B. COOK spent the last Lord's day in April with us in Philadelphia, and preached much to the edification and comfort of many. We rejoiced in this opportunity to hold intercourse with him, and hear him preach the good word of God. May the Lord abundantly furnish him to every good word and work.

Laborers are much needed at this time to procfaim the scripture doctrine of Life and Death, and the coming again, *from* heaven, our Lord Jesus Christ, to give Life and Immortality to his followers. Certain we are, that a greater and more effectual door was never opened to preach these grand gcspel truths than now; and the work is triumphing gloriously. Ministers of different denominations, we learn, are investigating the doctrine of Immortality *only* through Christ; and we know that if they investigate with an impartial mind, they cannot fail to see that there is *no eternal life nor immortality* except through and by Jefus Christ alone. Let God be magniged for the gift of his Son to bestow *life* upon men; and let all haste to this only source of hope and life.

———o———

BR. WM. ONGLEY'S Post Office *address* is Clarkson Centre, Monroe Co., New York. Br. Ongley is informed that "Aaron Ellis" has never sent us the manuscript for his pamphlet noticed in the Advent Watchman some time since; nor do we know as it will be possible for us to issue it if he should, as we have no funds to do it with.

———o———

BOUND BOOKS cannot be sent by mail, under the present Post Office Law. We have had several calls for "STORRS' MISCELLANY," to be sent thus. Br. McBride is informed that we have sent the one he ordered by Br. Marsh, who kindly took charge of it. Others who have ordered it, will please tell us how to send.

———o———

"THE MILLENNIAL HARP, a new collection of Scriptural Hymns, original and selected, for Social and Family Worship, adapted to the Wants of all Christians: By Marsh & Pinney, Rochester, N. Y." Price 62½ cents.

We have just received a copy of this work from the Publishers, but have not had time to examine its merits, yet presume it is good. It is a 12mo. of 500 pages, and contains 581 hymns, arranged under appropriate heads, with an index of subjects.

———o———

"THE AGE TO COME, OR *Glorious Restitution of all things spoken by the mouth of all the holy Prophets since the world began.* By Joseph Marsh, Rochester, New York."

This work contains 128 pp., 18mo; price 12½c. Without endorsing every expression in it, we think it is a work well calculated to spread scriptural knowledge on the subject of which it treats.

For sale by the Author, and at the Bible Examiner Office, Philadelphia.

———o———

THE
CHRISTIAN TRUTH-SEEKER
AND MISCELLANY,

IS PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EACH MONTH, AT
No. 68 North Eighth Street,
PHILADELPHIA.
GEORGE STORRS, Editor and Publisher.

Its object is expressed in its name, and by its motto, which is
"PLEDGED TO NO SECT NOR PARTY, BUT FREE FOR ALL."

TERMS—PAYMENT IN ADVANCE.

**Single Copy of 12 Numbers, 50c.; Five Copies, $2; Thirteen Copies, $5.**

*To Canada subscribers, the amount of postage must be added, as we are obliged to pre-pay it on all papers sent there.*

*All letters must be post-paid, and addressed*
GEORGE STORRS,
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VI. PHILADELPHIA, JUNE, 1851. NO. 6.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,
At 68 North Eighth Street, between Arch and Cherry,
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, $1; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; always in advance.

## LIFE IN CHRIST.

BY EDWARD WHITE, ENGLAND.

[Continued from page 72.]

It may be worth while to hazard a few observations, with a view to ascertain whether our theory of interpretation will not furnish us with a clue to the understanding of the remarkable phenomenon of the rise of the sects of the Pharisees and Sadducees, in the last ages of the Jewish Commonwealth.*

Their respective tenets are familiar to every reader of the New Testament. The Pharisees professed the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. "They believe" (says Josephus, who was himself a Pharisee, Antiq. xvii. i. 4) "that souls have an immortal vigor in them." *Consequently upon this doctrine*, they held that the righteous enjoy everlasting rewards, and that the wicked will be detained in an everlasting prison, consciously suffering the vengeance of God to all eternity. Some doubt has been raised as to their belief in the resurrection of the wicked; and a few critics have supposed that their notions of the resurrection of the righteous were tinged with the wide-spread oriental theory of transmigration; but Paul's declaration ("a Pharisee and the son of a Pharisee") that they did "allow a resurrection both of the just and unjust," (Acts xxiv. 15,) must be admitted as a formidable objection to both of these surmises.

The opinions of the Sadducees are equally well known. "They take away," says Josephus, "the belief of the immortal duration of the soul, and punishments and rewards in Hades." "They deny," says Luke, 'that there is any resurrection,' chap. xx. "They say," he repeats in Acts xxiii. 8, "that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit."

Now, a candid observer, who surveys the miraculous history of Judaism, will, we think, readily confess, that some difficulty arises in the inquiry as to the origination of such a sect as the Sadducees. It does not seem to be an adequate solution, to allege that their vicious lives led them to the adoption of materialist opinions; for, although there is much reason to think badly of their moral character, it should not be forgotten that the Pharisees, who zealously maintained a much more scriptural theology, were at least their equals in practical wickedness, since they are ever coupled together by Jesus Christ as "serpents, and a generation of vipers, who could not escape the damnation of hell." The fact, also, that the Sadducees were able to possess themselves of the chief seats in the Sanhedrim, and even of the supreme dignity of the high-priesthood, as in the instance of Caiaphas, indicates a certain degree of strength in their argumentation and intelligence, which could not be put down either by the learned scorn of the Pharisees, nor by the plain common sense of the populace; and which could scarcely have been anticipated if a clear, uninterrupted, and universal tradition, had sustained all the points in the creed of their opponents. The assertion of Josephus that "they were able to persuade none but the rich," requires the impartial reader to recollect, not only that these were likely to be amongst the best-informed men in the nation, but also, that Josephus himself was both a priest and a Pharisee. The politic division of the "multitude," also, by the Apostle, on the very points wherein the two parties differed, may show that, although "one part," and that probably much the strongest, were attached to the belief of a resurrection, another "part," and that not to be despised, were determined and violent Sadducees. It is not doubted that the bulk of the nation were followers and admirers of the Pharisees; but the spectacle of a considerable section of the learned men of the council steadfastly denying the main articles of the Pharisaical tenets, and of course, by a Jewish instinct, appealing to antiquity in their defence, must have created much hesitation and doubt in the minds of the uninstructed, on many of the disputed points; leading them perhaps generally to follow the faith of Gamaliel, and yet inspiring them with an earnest desire for the teaching of "Messias who should tell them all things."

It is not too much, then, confidently to suppose, that the Sadducees had at least some plausible reasons for their opposition to the more powerful party; and that although the latter both cherished and professed by far the most important portion of the Truth, the former also maintained some ideas sufficiently compassed about with evidence, to support their existence as a party, even amidst the intelligence of the age of Simeon, Onkelos, and Gamaliel.

We venture, therefore, to conjecture, in accordance with preceding statements, that the Sadducees correctly determined against the Pharisaical doctrine of the immortality of the soul, as unwarranted by the national Scriptures; and that this denial was the strength of their argument in attacking their adversaries. They saw, clearly enough, that the Old Testament nowhere inculcates either the abstract doctrine of human immortality, or that of the everlasting existence of the wicked; (but teaches that man has been driven out from the tree of Life, and that the wicked shall die;) and then, mistaking the honest disproof of these doctrines for the disproof of a future existence for the righteous, from a false supposition that the two must stand or fall together—they did as much violence to the numerous texts which set forth the promise of "eternal inheritance" to the people of God, in order to make their theory complete, as the Pharisees did to those which declare the *destruction* and *death* of the wicked, in order to bear out their scheme of universal immortality.

Thus the whole truth was divided between the two parties. The Sadducees had the Scriptures on their

* The rise of the Pharisees is usually placed a hundred years later than that of the Sadducees; but there is little doubt that Pharisaism (however it originated) was the embodiment of opinions at least as old as the Captivity, if not still more ancient.

side when they declared that man has lost the prospect of eternal life; that the soul alone is not a man; and that the Bible did not teach the soul's immortality; and they were also in harmony with it, when they held that *death* was the penalty of transgression. But they grievously "erred, not knowing the Scriptures," when, after the fashion of violent partisans, they ran into the extremes of materialism, and denied both the resurrection of life, and of judgment. On the other hand, the Pharisees were right in "thinking that in the Scriptures they had eternal life," and in vigorously maintaining the doctrine of future retribution. It was this great truth which gave them a desirable and inevitable sway over the minds of the multitude, for man's soul points to the Future as naturally as the needle to the pole. But they were altogether in the wrong in their notion of man's natural immortality, coupled as it probably was with some dreams as to the pre-existence of souls, learned from the Chaldees and Egyptians, and more recently from the Oriental, Pythagorean, and Platonic philosophies;* and they were equally mistaken in representing the punishment of the wicked as consisting in an everlasting endurance of torment.

The method of our Saviour's arguments with the two contending factions is in complete accordance with the preceding attempt to explain their mutual relations to each other and to the Truth. When called upon to choose between an association with one or the other, the *apostles* undoubtedly preferred consorting with the Pharisees; since they held the grand fundamental verity of future retribution; but it is exceedingly remarkable that our Lord (who after his ascension thus directed their conduct) did not himself show more favor to the one sect than to the other in the days of his flesh. He repeatedly warns his disciples against the "doctrine" of the Pharisees;—as though he would choose his followers to receive all the elements of truth afresh from his lips, as though the truth which they taught were still adulterated with a large proportion of error.

But that which most strikingly confirms the preceding view is the fact that when summoned to refute the Sadducean maxim of "no future life, neither angel, nor spirit," he did not ground his argument, as the Pharisees would have done, or a modern divine, upon the immortality of the soul; he did not suggest to them the natural consequences of that doctrine in respect to the wicked; but he fetched his overwhelming reply in favor of a future eternal existence, from a consideration of what was involved in the relation of *a God*—a relationship borne exclusively as an act of peculiar grace to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and their spiritual children, and involving a resurrection of their bodies. He thus, on a most important occasion, purposely omitted to teach the doctrine of the universal immortality of souls, and the consequences that flow from it, in a manner which seems to mark his reprobation of the tenet.

And again, when beleaguered by the followers of the Pharisees, who held in high repute this grand representation concerning human nature, he shocked their philosophy and their pride at once, by declaring that "unless they ate his flesh and drank his blood, *they had no life in themselves.*" "Ye search the Scriptures," he said, "for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of *me;* yet ye will not come unto me *that ye might have life.*" John v. These were the words which might have been expected from Him who brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel.

If it be objected, that a more abstract and decided refutation of the Pharisaical tenet might have been anticipated from Jesus, had it been untrue, we reply, that He could not teach in the language of our metaphysics; and, that the absence of the doctrine of human immortality from his discourses, viewed in connexion with the declaration above, affords all the satisfaction that can be reasonably desired.

* * * * * *

I. It would be endless to enumerate the passages of Scripture in which the bestowment of *Life* is declared to be the grand object of the constitution of Christ's mysterious person; and of his death and resurrection. "God so loved the world as to give his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but should have everlasting life." "I give unto my sheep eternal life, and they shall never perish; nether shall any man pluck them out of my hand." "He that hath the Son hath life: and he that hath not the Son hath not life."

Now we trust it will not be thought too much to observe, that this great distinguishing title of THE LIFE-GIVER harmonizes, in a very remarkable manner, with the doctrine, that in Adam the world lost its prospect of immortality. The result of being driven out from the Tree of *life* to Adam, was not merely unhappiness, but physical dissolution; and therefore it seems to be only carrying out the analogy, if we suppose that the *life* which the Redeemer bestows is the opposite of the physical *death* which trangression brought in. If mankind already possessed, through the Divine constitution, the attribute of everlasting life, if every man were by nature immortal, it cannot be admitted in the *proper* sense of the term, that the Messiah was the Prince of life and the author of immortality. His title, as the Life of Men, must be understood as being applicable to him only in a metaphorical sense, as the giver of happiness, without any reference whatever to eternal life properly so called. But when we recollect that the gospel itself is ever represented not merely as an instrument for operating on mind, but for regenerating, recovering, and redeeming the entire dissolved human nature, (see Rom. viii. 23,) we seem obliged to refer this appellation of Christ to his character as the restorer of that eternal life to the world which consists in the everlasting existence and conjunction of body and soul.

That this, the plain and natural signification of the term, was really intended by the Spirit of God, appears further from the connexion in which it first occurs. The Apostle John fixes the meaning of *life* to its literal sense, when he introduces the statement —"in him was life"—by declaring that "all things were made by him," clearly with the view of intimating, not that he was the fountain of happiness merely, or of holiness—but of *existence;* that with him was *the fountain of life.* The terms likewise repeatedly used in contrast with the life-giving grace of Christ Jesus, add fresh force to the conviction that literal life, vital being, is intended. "The thief cometh not, but for to steal, and *to kill,* and *to destroy;* I am come that they might have *life,* and that they might have it more abundantly." (John x. 10.)

* The dispersion of the Jews amongst the Asiatic and European countries after the Captivity, must have laid open to them all the philosophical systems in the world; from which they would naturally select, as the national intellect advanced, those doctrines which while they flattered the pride of man, could be in any manner reconciled with their own religion. Let the Platonism of Philo stand as one example on the Grecian side, of a tendency, which operated with equal force on the Oriental. See Burton on the Heresies, and Beavan's Irenæus.

And again,—"That he that believeth in Him should *not perish*, but should have everlasting life."

II. We pass on to consider the *work* of Christ, or the DEATH of the great Deliverer as the mode of redemption.

It has been a question with divines, whether Christ bore the original curse of the law; whether he suffered a pain and misery of the same sort, and of equal weight, with that threatened to Adam in the day of his creation, "Thou shalt surely die;" or whether he bore a different punishment which in consideration of His Divinity was accepted as a sufficient expiation. Baxter decides in favor of the former hypothesis; that he did suffer "a pain and misery of the same sort, and of equal weight with that threatened to Adam;" and perhaps we shall see reason to acquiesce in his judgment. The words of the Apostle, indeed, seem to be capable of no other interpretation. Gal. iii. 14: "*Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; as it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.*" The construction of this sentence, and the quotation of one of the curses of that "written" law, under whose sentence we lay, (the Law of Moses, viewed as a repetition of God's eternal law of morals,) appear to render it indubitable, that Christ *did* bear the curse of the law to which we are liable. For if the curse of the law in virtue of which we are, "by nature, children of wrath," were everlasting misery, there would be a strange disproportion between the two parts of the Apostle's statement. "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, everlasting misery, being made a curse for us;—not however *the* curse of the law, but only a curse, and that a very different one, written in the law—that of hanging on a tree." Thus it would seem, that there are two distinct curses of the law—everlasting suffering, and death by hanging on a tree; and that, although the the curse under which we lay was, according to this theory, the former, the curse which Christ bore, was the latter, which, notwithstanding, availed to deliver us from both.

But now, to look for a moment at the *facts;*—Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures. He laid down his life (*psuche*) for his sheep. John x. 15. He did not endure everlasting misery either of body or soul; but he was, *as a man, destroyed.* "The rulers sought to *destroy* Jesus." Matt. xxvii. 20. He suffered a dissolution of his compound nature of body, soul, and spirit. He defines his own *death* by comparing it to the *death* of a grain of wheat, (John xii. 24,) thus conveying the idea of disintegration of the parts of his nature. That *this death* was the penalty due to sin seems to be plainly asserted by the prophet Isaiah: "He hath borne our sins, and carried our sorrows: the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed. He poured out his soul unto death."

It is not, of course, necessary to suppose that the Saviour endured an amount of suffering equal to that collectively deserved by the whole race of mankind; for he was a propitiation for, and representative of, that race, regarded as one individual—the first sinful Adam. Neither need we suppose that the sufferings of the Redeemer were aggravated by the *sins* of the world, viewed separately from the first corrupting *sin* of Adam; since all subsequent transgressions have been but the development of the evil principle then introduced;—yet, inasmuch as the blood of Jesus Christ is effectual to the pardon of all the sins of mankind, it must be understood that they were reckoned as being seminally contained in that one offence which brought death upon Adam, and which was the formal cause of the necessity for the Redeemer's sacrifice—a sacrifice indispensable for the expiation of the paradisaical rebellion alone, but sufficient in its power of atonement to expiate the sins of all the world besides. "The free gift," says the apostle, "is of many offences unto justification." Hence it is, it may be presumed, that Jesus is said to have "delivered us from *the wrath to come;*" inasmuch as the sins of the descendants of Adam have incurred for them a second and more terrible punishment at the resurrection—of damnation; and the Redeemer delivers us both from the death which the sin of Adam brought in, and from that future wrath which we have deserved ourselves! *As a personally sinless man, he could not, as the representative of the race, be called upon to undergo any other than the original sentence.*

The curse of the law which Christ bore, then, was literal death; a dissolution of the compound humanity;—a curse which took no legal account of the subsequent destiny of the component elements of his nature. It was the shedding of his blood which the law required, since "without shedding of blood there is no remission." But the blood of the sacrifice, according to the Mosaic law, was the "LIFE thereof," and it was his "*blood*" which Jesus "gave *for the* LIFE OF THE WORLD."

The circumstances of suffering attending the execution of the curse might vary, according to the requirements of justice or the will of God. It might be a sudden—or a violent—or a lingering—or a prolonged tormenting destruction. It might be by disease, or by age, or by sorrow, or by the cross, or by fire:—none of these matters being defined in the threatening; the general demand of the law being for *the blood, or the life* either of the sinner or his substitute, but the determination of the mode in which the sentence should be carried out, (whether as originally intended, apart from the intervention of mercy, or as under a system of recovery, as men now die, or as in the case of a propitiatory sacrifice, or as in the awful destiny of the finally impenitent,) resting alone with that Sovereign Wisdom, which consults the honor of the law, and the welfare of the universe, and reigns in the administration of the moral government of God, the supreme interpreter of the details of the divine decrees.

That it was the mysterious union of an "Eternal Spirit" with the humanity which imparted its atoning efficacy to the "blood of the Lamb," the Scriptures plainly declare. "For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of a heifer, sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the (an) Eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" Heb. ix. 13. The Divine Word stood forth upon the earth as High Priest of creation, presenting "his flesh" as a sin-offering.

It does not, however, appear to be anywhere stated in Scripture, that the indwelling of the Divinity changed the character of the curse of the law, in the case of Jesus, from everlasting misery, into literal death. It will, therefore, be sufficient to receive the plain representation, that the Man Christ Jesus endured the true and real curse of the law, and that the sacrifice derived its propitiatory value from his conjunction with Deity. For aught that we can see, or the Scripture reveals, the human nature of Jesus might as justly have been required to endure the agonies of everlasting suffering—supposing these to have been the legal curse—as that shameful and

painful death which he did really undergo. If it be asserted, that it was the presence of the Godhead within which dispensed with the infliction of endless pains, through the substitution of an infinite majesty for the infinite misery of a finite being; there is no reason wherefore we should not reply, that on the same principle the divine nature of Jesus might have imparted an infinite value to any one of those stripes which he bore before the hour of his crucifixion, and thus have rendered that fatal death unnecessary. But the most serious objection to this statement is, that it represents the Majesty of Deity as the substitute and the sufferer; in opposition to those declarations which set forth the *humanity* as the expiatory sacrifice. This irreverent conclusion alone might urge us to escape as rapidly as possible from such calculations, and to find rest for our souls in the simple doctrine that the Lord Jesus bore the curse of the law, in its original sense, death, the shedding of his blood, the laying down of his life; that an infinite value was imparted to the offering by his union with the Divinity.

Thus do we derive an additional argument in favor of the former determination, that the *death* threatened to Adam was literal dissolution, without any further reference to a state of misery for the soul. The fact that Christ bore *this* death, did thus lay down his life as a man, did thus shed his *blood* for our redemption, is a convincing proof that *death* in the Bible signifies literal death, and that *life* signifies literal life: since it was not his "happiness," much less his "holiness" which the Saviour "laid down for his sheep," but his *existence as a man* composed of body and soul. There is no evidence whatever that he endured some commutation of the penalty denounced; there is no evidence that the criminal laws of the universe admit of such commutation in the case of federal redemption; there is no evidence for aught else than that his Godhead gave efficacy to the human endurance of "the curse of the law;" and therefore we feel quite at liberty to decide, that the death threatened to Adam was the death which Jesus underwent when he "frustrated him that had the power of death, and gave to them who all their lifetime were in bondage through fear of death" the hope of a resurrection to everlasting life.

This view of the life-giving death of Jesus Christ our Lord sets the doctrine of salvation by his *blood*, in a remarkably beautiful and striking light. The "sprinkling of his blood" is the pardon of sin; the bestowment of freedom from "condemnation" by that law whose sentence is death. "The blood is the life thereof;" therefore the "drinking of his blood" is the drinking in of the element of eternal life: "for his flesh is meat indeed, and his blood is drink indeed." We are by nature destitute of immortality, and under sentence of destruction; but in Him, through the "blood of the cross," we have reconciliation and resurrection. Since "sin and death" are inseparably united, forgiveness is as inseparably united with immortality. The *death* of the Lord Jesus being always placed in opposition to the impending *death* of man, we cannot suppose that the term has different significations in the two cases: and since the loss of "a right to the tree of life" in Adam was followed by "a return to the dust whence he was taken," it is impossible to avoid the conclusion, that He at whose death the veil of the *Holiest* (the type of *Paradise*) was rent asunder, has procured for us a literal and not a metaphorical participation of immortality. Thus, (if the parallel be not fanciful,) as the first Adam by *a tree* brought death into the world and loss of Eden, so did the Divine Redeemer by "*bearing our sins in his own body to the tree*" obtain the right to promise dying sinners, "This day shalt thou be with me in *Paradise;*" and, as the sin of the first man brought forth the *thorns* of the curse, so did the Lord from Heaven wear those *thorns* for a crown, and the curse removed. "He hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light, through the gospel?" The application of these statements to the interpretation of the symbolic rite of the "Lord's Supper," will be very obvious to the reader. The views here defended will lead us to regard that ordinance as a standing testimony against the doctrine of natural immortality, and in favor of the theology which attributes the eternal *life* of the saved exclusively to the "blood" of the Lamb that was slain. And when we take bread as Christ's "memorial," we receive his pledge of our everlasting existence in glory. "The bread which I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." Who would not respond to the invitation, "Take it and divide it among yourselves!"

[To be continued.]

## IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL.

The doctrine of the immortality of the soul of man, in a separate state of being from the body, lies at the foundation of the various systems of Theology that, at the present day, are taught in the schools, and in the nominally Christian church. This assertion needs no proof; as no one who is in the least acquainted with the nature of the subject and with the facts in the case, will presume to deny it. Indeed, so closely is this doctrine interwoven with the different creeds of the church, and so essential an element is it in their very foundation, that they cannot be separated, and with it they must stand or fall.

But notwithstanding this is so, and therefore the minds of many may be shocked at anything like a denial of this their darling and fundamental dogma, I shall prove, both from reason and the word of God, that the sentiment or doctrine that the soul of man survives the body at death, and continues to exist in a conscious state of happiness or misery is utterly false and of mischievous tendency.

"Infidelity!" cries the sectarian bigot, "he denies a future state of reward and punishment." Well, before I have done, I will show that the very fact that the immortality of the soul is regarded as indispensably necessary to a future state of conscious being, proves the doctrine to be mischievous in its effect, inasmuch as it bases all hope of eternal life and blessedness upon a false foundation.

The gospel that was preached by Christ and his apostles does not make the hope of the Christian to depend, for its consummation, upon death and the soul's immortality, but upon the resurrection of the dead. In Luke xx. 37, 38, our Lord says, "Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush, when he called the Lord the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For he is not a God of the dead, but of the living." Here we are taught by him who cannot lie, that inasmuch as the Lord is the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and yet he is the God of the living, and not of the dead, those ancient patriarchs named, who were dead, must live again. The declaration of the Lord that he was their God, proved their resurrection. But if their souls were then in conscious existence, was he not their God even without their resurrec-

tion? Most certainly. But as without this resurrection he could not be their God, it follows that they were not then in conscious existence.

Again, in John vi. 39, Christ declares, "And this is the Father's will who hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day." And in Luke xiv. 14, he says, "thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just." Thus taught our Lord Jesus Christ, and whoever teaches a contrary doctrine is antichrist. The apostles also, in all their teachings, made the second coming of our Lord Jesus Christ and the resurrection of the just, the grand theme—the only blessed hope. To the Athenian philosophers Paul seemed a setter forth of strange gods, because he preached unto them Jesus and the resurrection: and in the fifteenth chapter of his first epistle to the Corinthians, he declares plainly that if the dead rise not, then they that had fallen asleep in Christ were perished. But if the soul be immortal, how does it follow that the sleeping saints were perished, even though the dead should not rise? Certainly they are not perished if in a state of consciousness and bliss. Therefore the only hope for the child of God is the coming of the Lord and the resurrection: and whoever teaches that the soul of the believer enters into a state of heavenly blessedness at death, preaches another gospel.

Thus we see that the theology of the schools and of the professing church, and the teachings of Christ and his apostles, are directly opposed to each other. The gospel of Christ bases the hope of the church upon the sure foundation of Jesus and the resurrection, while scholastic theology places it upon the fable of the immortality of the soul. And as the teaching of this other gospel is calculated to make the true hope of the gospel regarded as of no consequence, or at most of but secondary importance, and to lessen in the mind the value and importance of the true foundation or object of the believer's faith and hope, its natural and necessary tendency and results are evil and evil only. Therefore the doctrine is false. Let then the gospel taught by Christ and his apostles stand in all its original purity and glory; while the false and pernicious gospel of a fancied heaven at death, "beyond the bounds of time and space," (!) falls to the ground.

But it is said that if the human soul be not immortal, man is no better than a beast. To this I answer that there is just as much superiority in a living man above a living beast, as there is a greater degree of the likeness of God, and no more. The mental faculties of man are superior to those of the brute: but this does not prove his immortality any more than the superiority of the mind of the dog to that of the snail proves the immortality of the dog. But as it regards a dead man, it is true that he is no better than a beast. And to this agree the word of God. See Eccl. iii. 19, "For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them: as the one dieth, so dieth the other, yea, they have all one breath, so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast." Again, Eccl. ix. 5, "For the living know that they shall die: but the dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten." Thus by the word of God it is proved that a dead man is no better than a dead beast; and that without the resurrection there is no reward after death. But inasmuch as the sleeping saints shall rise again to eternal life and glory, God is not ashamed to be called their God. "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also that sleep in Jesus will God bring with him." *Even so*, means in the same manner. *There is no other way.*

How false and foolish are the notions of those who imagine that, to the Christian,

> "Death is the gate to endless joy,
> And dying is but going home."

How absurd and ridiculously horrible the description given by Watts, of a soul descending to its place of eternal torment, after ascending to heaven to be judged!

> "Then swift and dreadful she descends
> Down to the fiery coast,
> Among abominable fiends,
> Herself a frighted ghost!"

Such is the trash that has been palmed upon the people in the name of Christianity. Thus have even the sheep of Christ's fold been led astray and fed with spiritual poison. And, as a consequence, how often have weeping friends stood around the bed of of the dying, and, as soon as the last agony and the last gasp were over, have exclaimed, "He knows more than all of us now:" whereas the word of God positively declares, "The dead know not anything." Nothing is more clearly taught in the holy scriptures than the entire unconsciousness of the dead; and that a future state of existence depends, not in part, but altogether, upon the resurrection.

It is asked if the scripture does not say that at death the spirit returns to God who gave it? It does, but what is the spirit? Certain it is, the spirit is not the soul: for Paul declares, in Heb. iv. 12, that the word of God divides asunder soul and spirit. And in 1 Thess. v. 23, he says, "I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless." So then, if the *spirit* be immortal, that does not prove the immortality of the soul any more than of the body. The Hebrew word is *ruach*, the Greek *pnuema*. Both are rendered by translation, *air*, *wind*, *breath*, or *spirit*; and, as applied to man, mean the principle or power of life. In Gen. ii. 7, we read, "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." Surely this does not teach us that man was made in two distinct parts, and then joined together. Nor does it teach that a part only of man was formed of the dust. It was *man*—the whole man; though until the principle or power of life was imparted from God, he was not a living man. As a beautiful and glorious piece of machinery; complete in all its parts, he needed only the motive power to put this perfect mechanism in action, thus constituting him a moving, sentient, reflecting, acting being,—in short, a living soul. Such he became when the life-giving God breathed into his nostrils the *ruach* or spirit of life. And when the dust returns to dust, that principle or power is withdrawn, and thus returns to God. The whole fabric called man is, therefore, "of the earth, earthy," and became a living soul by having the principle of life imparted from God, by means of the breath inhaled from the surrounding atmosphere. The life in the blood, which is kept in action by the breath, and from which life, motion, and the power of thought, are imparted to the brain and nervous system and to all the various organs of the human frame, thus producing all the phenomena of life, both mental and physical. And it is this alone that constitutes man a living soul. Consequently, when the breath or spirit of life is withdrawn, he ceases to be a living soul. Then everything appertaining to man is resolved into its original condition and element. The body returns to dust, the spirit or prin-

ciple of life returns to God who gave it, and as the soul, that is, animal life, cannot exist without the presence and life-giving power of the spirit, it is extinguished, like the flame of a candle. Therefore, if there be no resurrection, there is no future life.—*Selected.*

## THE DANGER AND REMEDY.

We have had put into our hands a volume of Tracts published in England in 1847, written "*by a Clergyman,*" and entitled the "*The Last Vials,*" being a series of "Essays upon the subject of the Second Advent."

There are many things in these essays that are exceedingly interesting. We give an extract from one. After the author had travelled over much of his ground in relation to present and coming events, and taken a view of "the nature of the Millenial Kingdom," he thus speaks:

"We are fully convinced that nothing but the doctrine of the Second Advent can restore the Church to its former life and vigour as a Christian assembly, or can afford a principle of firm contrasted opposition to the heresies and blasphemies of the present age. We are surrounded by heresy, infidelity, and iniquity, in every form; Popery is extending throughout Europe, and regaining its long-lost power over the kings of the earth, under the able management of the most accomplished Pope who has appeared since the memorable pontificates of Leo X, or of Sixtus V. Within our own Protestant Church, Tractarianism is daily circulating its poison, unperceived even by its own converts—drawing its venom from the foul sepulchres of the apostate fathers of the middle ages. It is true that it is but a feeble thing, and a reptile—yet a *viper* near at hand is more dangerous than a *lion* in the Vatican. Atheim is increasing over Europe, and forming an alliance with Popery. And, to destroy every hope of improvement, even education is corrupted through all its systems. The education of the rich and the learned is carrying out science to its utmost perfection, and trusting to that perfection, it scorns the interference of a God—it boasts of its own ability to restore the world, and says to the Almighty, "Depart from us! we desire not the knowledge of thy ways!" The education of the poor consists in a cold and lifeless repetition of catechism and creeds, too often got up for public exhibition, but too seldom impressed upon the heart; and when the poorer classes aspire to learning and science, they succeed in obtaining precisely enough to make them vain and self-confident, enough to make them *doubtful* upon all subjects, but too little to make them *decided* upon any. Proud, self-confident *science*—cold and formal *religion*—shallow and showy *education*, are the characteristics of the age, and in this state of the world what must be our only resource? It must be the preaching of the Gospel, you will reply. Yes, but in order that the Gospel may be an antagonist to these evils, it must have the qualities and characters of an antagonist. You cannot remove cold, except by introducing heat; you cannot conquer an enemy fully armed, while you are unarmed yourself. Every antagonist must possess opposing qualities to those which he contends with; and therefore it is not sufficient merely that the Gospel should be preached partially, but that it should be preached in its full extent; it is not *a* Gospel that we require, but *the* Gospel—the *whole* truth, as well as *some* truth. And for this purpose we must present to the eyes of the world, not merely Christ crucified, in the form of a servant, but Christ glorified, in the majesty of a king! This will be the Gospel in its full extent, and the most effectual opponent of every vice and heresy of the age. Let us now consider how fully the doctrine of the Second Advent possesses the qualities of an *antagonist.* Look around you and observe what are the prevailing heresies and vices of the world: St. Paul has foretold you what you are to expect in these latter times—"In the last days perilous times shall come. Men shall be lovers of *pleasure*, more than lovers of God. Having the form of godliness, but denying the power thereof." (2 Tim. iii.) St. Paul says nothing of war or violence; all is calm and prosperous; men are lovers of pleasure—they have the form of godliness; they are ever learning the truth—and yet these pacific times are pronounced by the Apostle to be *days of peril.* So it is at present, all is peaceful and prosperous—men are ever learning—they have the form of godliness—they pursue pleasure—and gold, the purchaser of pleasure, to the ends of the earth; the world is all awake with the activity and energy of feverish and surfeited prosperity, but it is an unhealthy and dangerous state, and it exactly agrees with the predictions of St. Paul. A deep corruption of the moral system, and yet outwardly calm, prosperous, and decorous. How cutting is the quiet sarcasm of St. Paul, when he speaks of the "*form of godliness,*" and of men *ever learning*, and yet connects these promising qualities with the most *perilous times.*

This shews what dangers may surround us while everything appears prosperous and correct; it shews that peace may be as perilous as war; and in a word it describes the present age, in which men have the form without the power of godliness, and in which they love pleasure (and money) far more than God. Now what is the fit remedy for this condition of the world? Not mere spirituality—not sickly sentiment, or religious *novel-writing;* spirituality *alone* can never be the fit antagonist of worldliness: you might as well take a beautiful picture and make it the antagonist of an armed man; or take the picture of a river and apply it to extinguish a real fire. Spirituality is in the mind and heart, but sensuality and worldliness are in the blood, and in the *reality* of life: one can never be directly opposed against the other. But take the kingdom and presence of Christ—speak to men of a new world—a celestial city—an all-powerful government, that will control and humanize all nations—that will baffle and supersede all the policy of kings and statesmen; tell them of a cabinet in which the Son of God shall preside, and of which all his saints shall be ministers. One that never can be deceived, and never can deceive; which cannot be broken up by faction, or terrified by the clamors of a sordid mob; which shall govern forever, with irresistible wisdom and power; tell them of a glorified and immortal body, such as the eye has never looked upon, in which the feeblest and most deformed saint shall appear before the world more nobly formed than Adam at his creation; tell them that in this godlike form they shall live with the King of kings, in the heavenly city, and reign over the nations; and shew them from Scripture, that all this is certain as *a fact*, and that it is drawing near to us *in time.* Preach to men in such language, and confirm it by the repeated evidence of God's word, and you will then have taken hold upon the heart—you will present to them *one real world*, as in opposition *to another*—you will find them lovers of pleasure, and there-

fore lovers of the present world. You will offer them still higher pleasures in a still better world—lasting pleasures in place of perishing—pleasures in security, instead of pleasures that are dangerous—reality that is eternal, in place of reality that is temporal. And thus you will present to them a full equivalent for whatever they give up; pleasure for pleasure, reality for reality. This is true *antagonism;* this is opposing the force of God's world to the force of Satan's world; throwing the weight of the new earth into one scale, to counteract the weight of the old world in the other. Satan being armed with a sword hardened in the furnace of man's passions, you are providing for his attack by hardening your own sword in the furnace of those same passions, kindled by fire from heaven. This is true *antagonism*, for it is opposing reality to reality.

The great secret of Popery, and of Tractarianism, consists in this knowledge of human nature, in the application of this principle of reality. Man must have some object which his mind can estimate, and which his senses can comprehend; he must have some sociability in his devotion and in his faith; something which approaches to his own level, and with which he can dare to be familiar. Popery has long since penetrated this grand secret of our nature, and she has given us a false reality, in order to satisfy our wants. The body of Christ is brought down from heaven, to be present with her humblest suppliants in her humblest churches. Her Priests and Pontiffs are the representatives of God upon the earth. Her ancient churches are peopled with the spirits of the dead, and every solemn aisle of her cathedrals is watched over by some departed saint, who still mingles with its services, and keeps guard over its congregations. The awful presence of the dead is thrown, like a gloomy veil, around her brilliant ceremonies, to heighten their effect by contrast. The shadows upon her venerable cloisters, are the shadows of departed saints, and wherever you may turn, in the woods or in the wilderness, she accompanies you with her patron saints, and with the soft presence of the Virgin Mary; bringing you into continual association with beings of your own nature, who can hear your prayers, attend upon your steps, and take a friendly interest in all your hopes and agitations. All this is false reality, indeed, but it is *dexterous*. It takes hold upon man, by the strongest fibres of his nature, his love for familiar associations, and for populous solitude. The solitude of a Romish devotee is never solitary, it is peopled with the illustrious dead. The cell of the Roman monk is never naked, its walls are curtained with the shadows of the awful tenants of the grave. What a skilfully-devised fable is here! What a mixture of religion and romance—of light and shade—of beauty and terror. The Italians were masters of the art of *painting* long before they proved it upon *canvass*. Their whole religion is a picture of exquisite coloring, as well as masterly design; but after all, it is nothing but a picture, it must fade at last. The Tractarians are daubing their British canvass with clumsy designs, and vulgar coloring, in an awkwark attempt to imitate the genius of Italy. But they never can succeed; the English nation is not gifted with Italian taste.

Need we repeat what has been remarked so often that the wisdom of God has provided a remedy for these deceptions, and a religion adapted to man's heart. In the very book which foretells to us the rise of Popery, God has given us an antidote to its attractions. He foresees the rise of a *false* but *picturesque* religion, just fitted to mislead our imagination, and he has provided against this, by giving us a *true* and holy religion, yet one which is the perfection of *pictured beauty*. The Lord reigning as a *man* over the earth—the lustre of the heavenly city—the Saints in glorified bodies—the vast armies of the Antichristian world—the great battle of Almighty God—the renewed earth—the Lord and his Saints governing the nations, like an heavenly cabinet; the peace and prosperity of a thousand years beneath this august aristocracy—the armies of heaven riding forth with the Lamb—the tremendous conflict of the Second Advent day—the glorious kingdom which that victory shall establish.

What is there in Popery, or in romance, so grand and so attractive to the heart? And if we add to this, that every true believer shall have a part in this kingdom—if we fancy to ourselves that wondrous day in which the grave shall open, and the departed Saints shall stand alive upon the earth, and then the grave shall close again upon the ungodly, and shut them in for a thousand years—we shall have a succession of grand images, which fill the mind and raise it above all the grossness of this life. And it will equally affect the heart, because every true believer has a promise of beholding it—"When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory!"

Thus this doctrine seizes upon the minds of the most worldly and the most sensual, and gives them a pure and heavenly subject for contemplation, without straining their comprehension beyond its strength. It makes heavenly things easy and familiar, by bringing them down to be transacted upon the earth. Such is the wisdom of God, the excellence and power of the Second Advent, which, strong in its simplicity and grandeur, can hold on its way unchecked, and can triumph alike over Italian wiles and Anglo-Catholic treachery.

Let every Christian, and every minister who desires to be fully armed against every attack of heresy, provide himself with this two-edged sword—Christ crucified, and Christ glorified. Let him draw together all whom he can influence, to meet and to confer on this subject; it is the last remedy which is left to restore the Church, the last remaining weapon to vanqnish Heresy; and if they meet, with prayer for divine direction, they shall be guided into ALL TRUTH, and realize in themselves that memorable promise—"Then they that feared the Lord, *spake often one to another;* and the Lord hearkened and heard it, and a book of remembrance was written before him, for them that feared the Lord, and that thought upon his name." Mal. iii.

———o———

CONTRIVING TO DO GOOD.—When Jonathan Edwards was a young man, he formed a series of resolutions embodying the principles upon which he intended to act and govern his future conduct and course of life. One of these resolutions was, to be continually endeavoring to find out some new contrivance to promote the glory of God, and the great ends of his own existence and that of his fellow-men. Should not such a determination as this exist in the heart of every Christian, and particularly every minister of the Gospel? If the men of the world exercise their powers of invention in devising new and efficient methods of advancing their temporal interests, should not those who belong to the kingdom of heaven do the same thing in reference to the spiritual welfare of mankind? For what purpose are the faculties of skill and contrivance given us, but to use them to the best advantage in doing the work of the Lord, "whose we are and whom we serve?"

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, JUNE, 1851.

SPIRIT RAPPERS.—We cut the following from La Roy Sunderland's "*Spirit World.*" We give it as an item showing that what we have before said, relative to the "Spirit Knockers," is true: that their *real object* is to bring the Bible and the God of the Bible into contempt, and thus "exalt themselves above all that is called God."

"'*Authority.*'—Whose words are these, 'Ye shall not eat anything that dieth of itself; *thou shalt give it to the stranger that is in thy gate, and* SELL IT TO AN ALIEN that HE MAY EAT IT; for thou art a holy people unto the Lord thy God.'—*Deut.* 14: 21.' Were a spirit or an angel to 'spell out' a *doctrine* like the above, what holy horror would be excited in a certain class of minds we could name."—*Spirit World*, May 10th.

We are truly pained to see one who in former years reverenced the Bible, thus descending to the very lowest infidel slang in order to keep in countenance the "*lying spirits*" to which he is now giving heed! A superficial mind may be staggered by such a text as Mr. Sunderland has quoted above; but how an intelligent mind, such as we have always supposed Mr. Sunderland possessed, could stumble at the words quoted from Deuteronomy it is not easy to see. Does he not see and know, that for the Legislature of Massachusetts to set itself to enact that the inhabitants of that State "shall not eat anything that dieth of itself," would be regarded as a work of supererogation and folly? Why? Simply, because no such law is needed—no one in that enlightened community has such a perverted appetite as needs thus to be restrained by the enactments of law. Such a law now passed in Massachusetts or any other State, would demonstrate that the custom of eating such food exists, or that the Legislators were fools.

The law given by Moses is conclusive evidence that the practice was common for persons to eat, in those days, things which were unclean, and animals that died a natural death. This being the *custom* of the times, the *taste* of the people, and their *relish* for such meat, led them to use it for food: and the same propensity was in Israel as in others in this matter; hence the necessity of positive law to prevent *a people*—whom God designed to teach *self-denial*—from polluting themselves with the customs and practices of the nations around them, who regarded not God nor his authority. "*Eat*" such meat those nations would, but God prohibited Israel from doing it, and assigns the reason, viz: "For thou art a holy [i. e. *a separate*] people unto the Lord thy God." But if others, not of Israel, choose to "eat anything that dieth of itself," you may "*give* it to" *them* or "SELL *it to an alien*," seeing they *will* eat it, and acknowledge not my right to legislate for them.

The sum of the matter is this: God would have, in the midst of the surrounding idolatry that universally prevailed in those times, a people who should be subject to his authority, and separated from the unlicensed self-indulgence which characterised that period of the world's history. To that people he gave the law in question, among others of like character, all tending to promote purity: but other people who chose to walk in their own ways, he gave up to their own perverted choice: they did eat that which died of itself, and preferred it, most likely. Thus no wrong, nor even impropriety, was committed in *giving* or *selling* them the meat in question. To take occasion from the ignorance or thoughtlessness of men, in these days, to slur the Bible and its Author, from such a text, is evidence of great blindness or great and inexcusable wickedness. We sincerely pray that whichever it may be, in Mr. Sunderland, God may lead him once more to "the feet of Jesus," and that he may become "clothed and in his right mind."

We conclude these remarks with the following from "*Dr. Chalmers on Infidelity:*"

"The truth of Christianity," says Dr. Chalmers, "is neither more nor less than the truth of certain facts that have been handed down to us by the testimony of reporters. Let the historical evidences on which it rests be made to pass in review, and become the subject of sober, inductive examination; let the question be decided by a patient and a fair inquiry; let the enemies of our faith show the world that their infidelity rests on higher grounds than a stale invective against the jugglery of priests, or the pertinence of a flippant witticism; let them bring along with them the spirit of cool and candid reflection, an anxiety after truth, and a ready submission to evidence. How little do they think, as they strut along in the pride of their infidel philosophy, how little of the spirit and temper of true philosophy is in them—of the humble, cautious spirit which Bacon taught and on which Newton rests the immortality of his genius!

"There is a puppyism in infidelity for which I have no patience. I thought that now-a-days both gentlemen and philosophers would have been ashamed of it! At the commencement of the last century one had some credit in sporting the language of unbelief and infidelity—for they were supported by the countenance of Shaftesbury and Bolingbroke, who, in addition to their being peers of the realm, had a sufficient acquaintance with their mother tongue. But infidelity, like every other fashion, has had its day; and since the masterly and triumphant defences of our English divines, it has been generally abandoned by the superior and more enlightened classes of society, and, to use the words of an Oxford Professor, 'is now rarely to be heard but in the language of * * blackguards.'

"I revere Christianity, not because it is the religion of my fathers—I revere it, not because it is the established religion of my country—I revere it, not because it brings to me the emoluments of office; but I revere it because it is built on the solid foundation of impregnable argument; because it has improved the world by the lessons of an ennobling morality, and because, by the animating prospects it holds out, it alleviates the sorrows of our final departure hence, and cheers the gloomy desolation of the grave."

———o———

What does it Mean?—Thomas J. Harris, of *Harrisburg, Pa.*, writes us—I observe in the German Reformed Messenger, dated April 9th, 1851, the following article:—

"*The Doctrine of Annihilation.*—We learn from the Lutheran Standard, that several of the ministers of the Lutheran Synod of Indiana have broached the doctrine of the 'Final destruction or annihilation of the wicked.' For these views they were not only sustained and tolerated by the Synod, 'but some who differ from them * * * are condemned and excommunicated for their opposition to these views, by that body. One of them, a Mr. Budisill, declares that the view as held by him, is found in the Augsburg Confession. At the same time, however, he declares himself adverse to any confession, except the Bible—a very convenient trap door for casting out any doctrine that may not suit the individual tastes of men, whilst they are not honest enough to leave a church, whose doctrines they do not heartily believe."

Is it really true, that a "Lutheran Synod" believes and acts as seems to be indicated in the foregoing article? That Lutherans should renounce and repudiate the doctrine of the *natural* immortality of the soul is what we should expect; for Luther early pronounced it one of the "Roman *dung-hill decreetals*;" but that they should "condemn and excommunicate some who differ from them for their opposition," is not creditable either to Lutheranism or Christianity, provided opponents act with a Christian spirit. No man who believes the Bible, and whose acts and spirit correspond with its holy requirements, is to be proscribed from Christian fellowship because he differs from his brethren in opinion as to what is the sense of Scriptural expressions. We think the Lutheran Standard must have been misinformed as to the treatment the opposers met with: at least we hope the statement is incorrect.

The article, however, shows that the old doctrine of immortal soulism and *endless torture* is finding its grave; and we hope it will soon go down into *sheol*, and never find a resurrection. It has been permitted to dishonor God, defame his character, and produce infidelity long enough: but let it die a legitimate death. That is—let the Sword of the Spirit—the word of God—slay it, and not church excommunications, or persecution in any form. The truth of God is the only armor needed to do the work. In the use of that may we all learn of Him who spake as never man spake, and whose word was with power.

———o———

1 Corinthians xv. 22.—*Baltimore*, 21st May, 1851.—Friend Storrs:—I have repeatedly thought of calling your attention to the 22d verse of the 15th chapter of Corinthians; the meaning and force of which has, in my opinion, been greatly impaired, if not entirely lost by regarding the last clause of it as intended to prove the resurrection *of all*, when to my mind it evidently applies only to those *in* Christ. I do not mean to question the resurrection of the just and unjust, but I do not believe it was the intention of the Apostle to teach it in this place. His purpose was to show that those in Christ were as sure of life as those in Adam were of death. I would therefore read it: "As all in Adam die, so all in Christ shall be made alive." You may have noticed this in some of your writings, which have not come under my observation, but having seen it used in what I deem an erroneous manner, I thought it well to call your attention to it; for, to me, it is a forcible illustration of the great doctrine that there is no eternal life but in Christ Jesus. Yours, truly,

Wm. P. Lemmon.

Our friend Lemmon is most likely correct in his suggestion. Certain it is, that the resurrection of the wicked is not the subject of this chapter. It is the resurrection of those who have "*fallen asleep in Christ*" that Paul is speaking of throughout the chapter. The resurrection of the wicked is no part of his argument. He is speaking of those *in* Christ in distinction from "*all*" other "men:" see verse 19. He first shows the certainty of Christ's resurrection from many and infallible witnesses. This point settled, it follows inevitably that all the member's of Christ's body will also come up from the dead, their union with Christ, or being *in* him, as certainly drawing after it life—*eternal life*—as their union with Adam the first inevitably draws after it death, or dissolution. Hence he says—"For since [or, by means of] man [*viz*: Adam the first] came death, [upon all who were in him, *viz:* all men] by man [Adam the second, or Christ, shall come,] also [or in like manner] the resurrection of the dead [who have "fallen asleep in Christ:" verse 18;] for [*gar—for example*] as in Adam [by being *in* union with Adam] all die, *so* [in like manner, those] *in* Christ shall all be made alive."

This 22d verse is purely explanatory of the preceding; and as the preceding is entirely an argument relating to the resurrection of Christ and those who have "fallen asleep in him," we have no right to construe the Apostle's words to include the whole human family. It was not the Apostle's method, in any of his epistles to illustrate any subject by a reference to the resurrection of the wicked, but the re-

verse. In 1 Thess. 4: 14, he speaks of the same subject thus: "If we believe that Jesus *died* and rose again, *even so* them also that *sleep in Jesus* will God bring with him." Where did God *bring Jesus from?* Paul answers, Heb. 13: 20, "Now the God of peace, that *brought again from the dead* our Lord Jesus Christ," &c.

The subject then is clear God brought up Christ from the dead, and will just as certain bring up all that sleep in him. It is no more certain that we all die by being *in* Adam than it is that all who are *in* Christ will be made alive by that union, and die no more—"death" will have "no more dominion over" *them*, than it hath over the *head* of the body—*viz:* Christ. As "he dieth no more," so his members will die no more. How important and precious is Christ; and how indispensible is union with him to secure a resurrection to life eternal.—Ed. Ex.

## THE TRUE SOURCE OF LIFE.

BY THE EDITOR.

Texts.—For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself. He that hath the Son, hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God, hath not life. And so it is written, the first man Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. Howbeit, that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy; and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.—John 5: 26; 1 John 5: 12; and 1 Corinth. 15: 45–50.

The following points present themselves from these portions of Scripture, viz: Unoriginated, Independent and Endless Life resides in God the Father *alone.*—By the *gift* of the Father, Endless Life resides in Christ.—Adam had not in himself, nor have any of his posterity by generation, or birth, endless life.—Endless life, for man, is *in Christ alone.*—This life can only be perfected by a resurrection or translation.

I. Unoriginated, Independent Endless Life resides in God the Father alone. Such life must be located somewhere. In the nature of the case we can go no higher to find its source. God appeals to this attribute on solemn occasions, or to confirm his word. "Truly *as I live*, all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord." Numb. 14: 21. "Say unto them *as I live*, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked," &c. Here then we have the highest source of life appealed to; and of necessity it must be unoriginated and independent.

II. By the Gift of the Father, Endless Life resides in Christ.

This, the first text affirms, "As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he *given* to the Son to have life in himself." "It *pleased* the Father that in him should all fulness dwell:" Col. 1: 19. This *fulness of life* was not complete till his resurrection: then "death hath no more dominion over him:" Rom. 6: 9. "Whom God hath raised up, [from the dead] having loosed the pains of death, because it was not possible that he should be holden of it:" Acts 2: 24. The anointed Jesus was begotten, or generated of Mary by the Holy Spirit of God; and by the same Spirit was he "the *first born* from the dead:" Col. 1: 18, and 1 Pet. 3: 18; and now "ever liveth," and hath "the power of an Endless Life." Heb. 7: 16.

III. Adam had not in Himself, nor have any of his Posterity, by generation, Endless Life.

The threatening of *death* is proof of this point. To threaten a being with death who had endless life; or, which is the same thing, had immortality, would show a lack of wisdom which we dare not attribute to the Lord our God.

Exclusion from the tree of life "lest man should take and eat thereof and live forever" is proof positive that he had not endless life in himself. On this point we have the plain and positive testimony of Paul that our proposition is true. We will now examine that testimony as presented in 1 Corth. 15: 45 to 50. In the 44th verse he says, "There is a natural"—*psuchikon*—an *animal* "body," or *person;* so the term "body" often signifies: and in that sense this apostle uses it in other places. Chap. 5: 3, he says, "I verily as absent in *body*," &c., that is, *personally* absent. Again Heb. 10: 10, he says: "We are sanctified through the offering of the *body* of Jesus Christ once for all." Surely our Saviour offered something more than merely a body; for he "poured out his *soul* to death"—he "gave *himself* for our sins." Gal. 1: 4. To return. The apostle affirms there is an animal person, and there is a spiritual body, or person. And that he is speaking of the entire person, and not of the *body* merely, is evident from the followiug part of his argument; for he adds, "And so it is written, the first *man* Adam was made a living soul." Here is the proof that there is a natural body, or *animal person.* He appeals "to the law and the testimony," and that records that the first man was made an animal man—a living person: not an *immortal* soul—he says no such thing—that would have destroyed his argument, which is to prove the first man, or Adam, was liable to corruption. The phrase "living soul," which Paul quotes direct from Genesis 2: 7, never can prove that man had an immortal soul, any more than the same language can prove that all the fowls, fishes, cattle and creeping things have such souls; for the same is said of them, Gen. 1: 20 and 30, as is said of man chap, 2: 7. The

original in each of the three cases is *nephesh hayah*—living soul; which expression puts the fishes, fowls, cattle and creeping things and man all on a level as to any natural immortality: one was just as much so as the other, and no more, in himself. The apostle's appeal, therefore, to this account of man's creation, shows that he regarded man, of himself, by creation, as a mere animal man; and this he positively asserts in what follows: for he proceeds to say, "That was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural," or *animal*. Here the apostle does clearly affirm that the first man Adam was not spiritual, but that he was an animal. Surely here is no indication of an *immortal* soul or a *spiritual nature*, as some maintain, but the reverse. Here we are perfectly aware immortal soulists will be filled with horror, and cry out—"What! man a mere animal?" Yes, gentlemen, you who would-be-"gods," hear it; you are by virtue of your descent from Adam but mere animals; though the "father of lies" has tried ever since he tempted mother Eve to make men think they are gods—or are immortal. "Ye shall not surely die" has ever been his motto: but Paul declares they are natural persons—animal men; and he affirms that to be the testimony of God by Moses. But let us hear him further. "The first *man* is of the *earth*, EARTHY." Surely this is a fatal blow to those proud hearts who talk of their "*spiritual*, and immortal nature." Hold! says Paul, "the first man is of the earth, earthy," and "as is the earthy," [natural, or *animal*] "such are they also that are earthy:" or such as have their descent from Adam. As a stream naturally can rise no higher than the fountain, so all born of Adam, the first man, are of earthly origin, or are only animals, tending back to the earth again like all other animals. A mortifying reflection, truly: and proud man, fancying himself a god, and claiming that he has a soul that is a "simple essence, uncompounded, immaterial, indestructible, and immortal," will of course make war on the apostle just so soon as he sees clearly the drift of his argument. It is truly humiliating, after one has taken the seat of God, and claimed affinity to him in immortality, to be made to know that all this self-exaltation is from the father of lies; and that man is by creation, or generation, only an animal, and destitute of a spiritual nature—that at best he is only the highest order of animals, with a *capacity* for the development of moral qualities and the reception of a spiritual nature through another medium, which we shall soon consider. The animal man, though his intellect may be developed so as to soar among the stars and tell their magnitude and revolutions, and to search out the secret things hidden in the depths of the earth, yet is after all but an animal, and will "perish forever like his own dung," [see Job 20: 7.] unless he comes to another source than himself for immortality; for, adds the apostle, "flesh and blood" [i. e. man by natural descent] "cannot inherit the kingdom of God;" and for this plain reason—that kingdom is *everlasting*, and man by creation or generation has no prinoiple of perpetual existence in him, and hence must gain it from some other source or cease to be in the universe of God like any other mere animal.

To this may be added the fact that man's *dominion* was over the animals; which imports, that at his creation he was himself an animal, only of the highest order; otherwise there seems an inappropriateness in the language of scripture and in the design expressed in creation. "God said let us make man * * * and let them have *dominion* over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth:" Gen. 1: 26: Compare this with Ps. 8: 4–8: "What is man, that thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that thou visitest him? For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with with glory and honor. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things under his feet. All sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field; the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea, and and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the sea." All goes to show that man was in his proper sphere as ruler over other animals; and that was his standing till such times as further developments could be made of him, or some other qualities should be added by trial, or otherwise, which should fit him for a higher sphere than that of a mere animal.

Further, that man was a mere animal, though of the highest order, and capable of developments which the subjected animals were not, is evident from his trial. That was the trial of an animal—it related to food—*to eating*. He was placed in Eden, and bid regale himself, or gratify his nature, by eating freely of all the fruits of the garden save one. Of that one he was not to *eat*; that prohibition related to him as *an animal*, and was evidently designed to bring out in man, or produce in him, a quality which he had not *by creation*, because such a quality cannot be created—it is not an entity, nor anything that can be created; it is an attribute, and must be induced by some cause whereby there is trial. Man, at his creation, was capable of no higher trial than that of an animal; so the test was, *to eat*, or *not to eat*: that was the test, and such as was suited to man as one put in dominion over other animals. By this test, if obedient, he might advance in the scale of being, and approach to the development of a spiritual nature, which previously he had not. In the trial he failed, and fell under complete subjection to the animal nature with which he was created; and God provided another medium to bring out a spiritual nature, or spiritual man: that is, He pro-

vided a "*second Adam*," whose origin was not of the dust of the ground, but heavenly; though united to and become one with "flesh and blood;" for "the Word—*Logos*—was made flesh and dwelt among us;" or, because those to be delivered "are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same:" thus taking hold on our animal nature, that we by taking hold on his spiritual nature, by faith, might have developed in us a spiritual nature and thus attain unto holiness, immortality, endless life. This leads us to say—

IV. ENDLESS LIFE, FOR MAN, IS IN CHRIST ALONE.

Thus John speaks in our text, 1 John 5: 12, "He that hath the Son hath life, he that hath not the Son of God, *hath not life.*" In the previous verse he affirms this is the record, [that we are called to "believe," viz:] "that God hath given unto us eternal life, and this life is in his Son:" and he declares that the rejection of this record is to make "God a liar." Yet, alas! how many professed Christians, even—ignorantly we hope—do deny, *in fact*, the truth of this record, and claim that they have endless life, or, which is the same, immortality without regard to Christ.

Let us now examine the apostle's argument as to how the spiritual man is produced. He informs us it is by the *second* Adam. "The last Adam," says he, "was made a quickening spirit"—or *life-giving* spirit. "That *was* NOT *first* which is spiritual, but that which is natural," or *animal;* "and AFTERWARD that which is spiritual:" * * "the second man is the Lord from heaven," or of *heavenly origin.* As the first was from the earth, earthy—a mere animal, and not spiritual: so the second is from heaven, begotten by the Spirit of God; so that in him dwelt divine or spiritual life, the principle and source of immortality and endless life. Now we begin to see the need we have of Christ; and the value of him to a perishing world. Whatever intellectual or, so-called, "moral" qualities may be manifested by any descendant of Adam the first, there is no approach to a *spiritual nature*, nor to immortality and endless life, till a *union* is formed with the second Adam, who is of heavenly origin: out of Christ there is nothing but corruption and death—extinction of all sense and consciousness, or to perish like the beasts: but in Christ is life and immortality. Refuse and reject him, you perish, *utterly, totally*, and forever. Come to him—be united to him as the branch to the vine—live upon him by faith, and you are a "new creature"—a "spiritual nature" is developed—the man is born of the Spirit; and now has spiritual senses, which he had not before: he now sees spiritual objects: knows and loves God, which he did not before, however much his intellect might have been convinced there is a God. "The natural"—*psuchikos*—the *animal* "man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned;" and that discernment he has not, and cannot have till he has a spiritual nature *imparted*, which can *only* be done by a *union* with Christ, the second Adam, and head of the spiritual creation. Hence, the first thing required by the gospel is *faith in Christ*, in order to the new birth, and the development of spiritual senses. The highest attainments in what are denominated moral qualities cannot produce this developement; nor bring a soul of man out of his mere animal condition, or save him from perishing, unless he is united to the fountain of endless life that God has opened in his Son. A union with Christ or endless death must be the portion of all that proceed from Adam who was of the earth, earthy. United to Christ, and abiding in him, as the branch abides in the vine, we shall not only have a spiritual nature—or be "partakers of the divine nature"—but our "vile body" will ultimately be "*changed;*" for, "as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly," saith Paul. "*We*"—Who? *All* men? No. Who then does Paul mean by "*We?*" He tells us verse 50, "*brethren*," and verse 58, "my *beloved brethren.*" This leads us to say—

V. THIS ENDLESS LIFE CAN ONLY BE PERFECTED BY A RESURRECTION OR TRANSLATION.

The apostle had clearly stated this fact in the previous part of this chapter, when he said, "If the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised; and, of course, there is no fountain of endless life; and "then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." All future life turns on the reality of the resurrection. Without that all are lost—all are perished who have died; and "we who have hope in Christ are of all men most miserable;" because, now we suffer, and deny ourselves such pleasures as mere animal men delight in; and doing all this in hope of a future and endless life, we are losers if there is no resurrection of the dead. Yes, saith the apostle, "if the dead rise not, let us eat and drink" enjoy ourselves as animals—"for to-morrow we die," and that ends all our hope. But he affirms the dead will rise, and the living in Christ be changed. "Behold, I show you a mystery"—a secret—"We shall not all sleep"—or die—"but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed." "*We.*" Who? All men? No. The apostle has clearly distinguished between those of whom he speaks and other men, verse 19, "If in this life only *we* have hope in Christ *we* are of *all men* most miserable." Thus we see the apostle means by "*we*" a specific class of men, viz: those "*in* Christ"—or those who by "*faith*" are united to Christ. Such, if dead, will be raised incorruptible; or, if living, will be changed to incorruption: "for

he adds, "this corruptible
and this mortal must put
the only way immortality
endless life can be perfec
continues, "when this co
incorruption, and this m
mortality, then shall be
that is written, Death is
Then is the work perfect
tered upon; for they can
glorified in their head, "

INFERENCES. 1. Out
perish, like the beasts.
than that derived from t
the earth, *earthy*—not h
immortal—no endless li

2. Those who do have
delivered from its sting
this triumph "through
give "thanks to God, w

3. We who have belie
towards God for such
have abundant cause to
ble, *always* abounding i
asmuch as we know ou
Lord: "the end is life
their fruit unto holiness
him who is is invisible
time, if we faint not."

---

"NOMENCLATORY."—
land, in the last numbe
to take Andrew Jackso
ceptible mesmeric subj
in that paper affirms—t
of the spirits with whi
S. says, that for "abou
"never once mentione
gels or spirits by whon

The facts about it s
meric" Davis talks, as
St. Paul, Solon, Swe
other great characters
ONLY AUTHORIZED" ex
sers. We judge this
old friend Sunderland.
ignorant, proud, mesm
has been under the "s
Magnetism, as practis
salist clergymen, on A
an editorial correspon
wonder, we say, that
*see* that such impude
the oracles he has her

"Names!" says Mr.
name amount to? Mo
name be appropriate
That is a home-thru

he adds, "this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality." This is the only way immortality is to be received, or that endless life can be perfected; and "so," the apostle continues, "when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up of victory." Then is the work perfected, and eternal life is entered upon; for they cannot "die any more," but are glorified in their head, "Christ, who is our life."

INFERENCES. 1. Out of Christ men will utterly perish, like the beasts. Having no higher nature than that derived from the first Adam, they are of the earth, *earthy*—not heavenly—not spiritual—not immortal—no endless life.

2. Those who do have victory over death—who are delivered from its sting and from its victory—attain this triumph "through our Lord Jesus Christ;" and give "thanks to God, which giveth us the victory."

3. We who have believed in Christ, and have hope towards God for such a deliverance and salvation, have abundant cause to be steadfast and immoveable, *always* abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as we know our labor is not in vain in the Lord: "the end is life eternal" to all such as "have their fruit unto holiness." Let us endure as seeing him who is is invisible, for "we shall reap in due time, if we faint not."

———o———

"NOMENCLATORY."—Under this head Mr. Sunderland, in the last number of his "Spirit World," seems to take Andrew Jackson Davis—"one of the most susceptible mesmeric subjects in the world," as a writer in that paper affirms—to task for dealing in the *names* of the spirits with which he communicates; and Mr. S. says, that for "about one year" he himself has "never once mentioned the *names* of any of the angels or spirits by whom" he has "been visited."

The facts about it seem to be these. The "Mesmeric" Davis talks, as he claims, with "St. John, St. Paul, Solon, Swedenborg, Dr. Franklin," and other great characters, and so claims to be "THE ONLY AUTHORIZED" expounder of these spirit matsers. We judge this must be rather galling to our old friend Sunderland. And no wonder; to think an ignorant, proud, mesmeric, Jack-with-a-lantern, who has been under the "sectarian schooling of Animal Magnetism, as practised for five years, by Universalist clergymen, on Andrew Jackson Davis," as saith an editorial correspondent in the same paper; no wonder, we say, that Mr. Sunderland should *begin to see* that such impudent pretenders were no longer the oracles he has heretofore thought Davis to be.

"Names!" says Mr. Sunderland, "What does the name amount to? Mortals cannot *know* whether the name be appropriate or not. How can they know?"

That is a home-thrust, friend Sunderland. Yes, "how can they know?" The spirits that visit Andrew Jackson Davis are either very ignorant or *very great liars* if they give wrong names to themselves. Which is it? friend S. We are satisfied it is the latter. But then it was the "*Revelations*" of this same Andrew Jackson Davis, if we have not misunderstood Mr. Sunderland, that first gave his mind that bias by which he was led to doubt, or discredit the Bible, and thus was prepared to follow these "*lying spirits*," which at first approached him as his little "*sons*," who died when babies. But latterly he does not give the "*names*" of those "angels or spirits" that approach him; and his mind seems to be revolting from the disgusting "Revelations" of that Mesmeric tool that Satan has employed to preach "peace and safety." We are glad that Mr. S. seems to be becoming sensible that some of those communicating spirits are very great fools or liars. For he asks "How can they [Davis and others] know their *names?*"—the names of the spirits that approach them. If they do not know their own names, they are fools, for La Roy Sunderland's dead babies knew their names, it seems, when they communicated with him: and if babies know their names, there could be no adult so ignorant as not to know his name, unless he was a fool or on insane person. If the spirits did know their own names and yet assumed the names of others, they were liars. We are not of those who believe that all this "spirit knocking" business is "*toeology*" or "*kneeology*." We have seen no reason yet to call in question but that there is a real development of supernatural power; and we have no doubt it is a Satanic development—a "strong delusion," to which many will be given up "to believe a lie," and thus perish because they have gone after "familiar spirits," and thus departed from the Living God.

We do most sincerely hope and pray that our old friend Sunderland may yet have his eyes fully opened to the devilish character of this spirit-knocking manifestation, and employ his powerful mind and pen in resisting and exposing its soul-destroying work; and not slide off from it into Swedenborgianism, to which he seems now to be tending. Better come back to the Bible than to follow that *ignus fatuus*; for Swedenborg, however sincre and honest even, was as great a fanatic as Davis himself, and not a whit more consistent.

———o———

TAKE CARE TO GET ON THE RIGHT BOAT.—On leaving Philadelphia, we came to the wharf whence the boat was to convey the passengers en route to our great commercial metropolis. We passed over the wharf, and took our stand with a feeling of satisfaction, on a large steamboat. We felt that, having hastened, we had arrived in time, and were sure of a passage by the first line to our destined place. I set down my valise deliberately to talk with my brother, and congratulate myself on being "ready," and in

time. Soon, however, as our attention was still awake to our journey, we saw enough to excite suspicion. "Is this the boat that that leaves for New York?" said I to a passing porter. "No sir! This way if you please." I followed and found that the first boat was only used for *passing over* to the conveyance that was wanted!

"Ah," said I, "we must watch and take care to get on the right boat!" We hurried on to the boat then just ready to leave. This excited profitable reflections. A little longer, and we should have been "too late."

Many imagine themselves much in earnest as to religion. They seem to hasten, reach a point, and self-complacently *take a stand*, saying "we are ready—we are in time and safe!" But no. They are only on some miserable wharf-boat! It comes in the way, but it cannot convey them a foot on their journey! They stop at "the baptism of John," and come short of the Christ who alone can convey them to glory, in the capitol of His Kingdom. Lord help us all to keep awake and watchful. There are many mere wharf-boats. They may lie in our route, but if we watch we shall pass them all and get on the right boat. Soon it will sail for the capitol of God's everlasting Kingdom.

J. B. Cook.

———o———

From M. Batchelor.

*Pownal, Vt.*, May 5th, 1851.

Bro. Storrs:—I preached at Potter Hill, Rensselaer Co., N. Y., yesterday, on Eternal Life, in the forenoon, and the establishment of the Kingdom of Jesus on Earth, in the afternoon. I had a good hearing with a hearty invitation to visit them again. If I had a thousand tongues, I could employ them all in the promulgation of this glorious truth; and there are people that would hear, but not among the sects. No. God's people are scattered, and I long for the appearance of the Chief Shepherd to gather the scattered flock. I am as ever yours, in hope of life at the appearance of Jesus.

———o———

From Dr. John Fondy.

*Albany, N. Y.*, April, 1851.

Bro. Storrs:—I send you $3, $2 of which is to be applied for the Examiner, the remaining $1 to pay for your new paper. I am glad to see that you are pushing on the car of truth and not relaxing, but rather increasing your efforts to meet and overcome with the word of God the errors and delusions of the present day. I have read your views about Antichrist and Satan. You remember my view about the abomination of desolation was that it was to be the leader of the Gog and Magog host who was to go up against the Jews, to whom this character referred—and I considered the head of that host to be the Emperor of Russia, the chief prince of Mesheck and Tubal. This prince was to push towards the South East and pleasant land. (That the abomination of desolation is Russia or the chief Prince of Mescheck and Tubal, a comparison of 38 Ezek., 11th Dan., and 2 Thess. 2 chap., proves—they all come to the same end.) Now Russia is pushing in just these directions. She is advancing south towards Turkey; she is moving East—Circassia acts yet as a strange barrier—and why? Because God's time is not yet come. When it does, then he will move rapidly in all these directions. The Emperor of Russia aims too at religious eminence—to be the head of a widely extended system of religion. Now, Bro. Storrs, may not Satan possess this Emperor so that he will (despot as he already is, and then much more so) claim divine honors? I throw this out as a suggestion. I thank God for the belief which I have in the doctrine of the unconscious state of the dead—it saves me perfectly from all delusions founded on the belief of the error that men are conscious after death—thankful also am I that he has made you an instrument in the work of enlightening so many, myself among the rest, on this and other points connected with the word of God.

Yours affectionately, in the hope of eternal life through Jesus Christ.

———o———

From Thomas L. Stanton.

*North Yarmouth, Me.*

Bro. Storrs:—I am a man 30 years of age; when I was a lad of 18, I saw myself a sinner, and fled to Christ for salvation, and after a little time found the Saviour to the joy of my heart. I was filled with love, and loved every Christian of every name, and was astonished afterward to behold the jarring and contentions among themselves.

Years rolled on; and in my meditations I discovered things which I could find none to answer. I wondered when I heard that the millions of poor benighted heathen were to be kept suffering eternal pains. I wondered how the devil and all his works were to be destroyed, and yet he hold eternal sway over more than nine-tenths of men whom God had made.

I wondered when I heard preachers preach, and saints call it the gospel, when it seemed to me that they made out that the great and glorious Being was possessed of attributes worse than poor frail man.

I also wondered that ministers and others should go so much beyond the Bible, and seem to glory in it, in holding up the eternal distress of the wicked. I have seen them, in the onset, hang out so many frightful pictures that sinners would not believe or receive what compassionate truths they did utter. I say, all these things, and many more I could mention, came upon me like an armed man, and I resisted them from time to time, thinking they came from an evil source. As to going into that great

delusion called Universalism, I could not; for I saw it was a great contradiction of the bible and reason. I had not even heard whether there was any doctrine of the destruction of the wicked, only what was in the bible; and that our folks spiritualized all away, and so kept along year after year until at length I happened to hear an old Englishman, who was a dyer, at work in my employ, and he had been at work in the State of Connecticut, speak of it, and had by some means obtained a copy of your six sermons. He lent them to me—I read them, and wondered I wandered in the fog all my life. Things opened to my mind so suddenly, not only the things you treated of, but others in that train. Well, my wife was a pious Methodist, as well as my old friend, the dyer, and so we had (or thought so) to converse and study to ourselves for fear of being called heretics, and being turned out of the Synagogue. However, we lent the book to one of our churchmen, an influential man, (confidentially, of course,) and after reading it, much to our surprise, he was stronger than ourselves. I was at that time clerk of the Maine Western Christian Conference; and at its yearly sitting, this question was called up in reference to one of our preachers holding the doctrine of "Annihilation," as it was called by them. Between the Sessions, at noon, I sought the brother and found him firm in the faith, and a very able advocate of it too; but he is kept back, and hid from view, as thousands are because it is unpopular; but, to their praise be it spoken, they did not deal with him for his particular faith, although it differed from theirs. In the meantime I took good care to keep myself out of sight in regard to this thing. But as I often go to Boston on business, I fell in with some of the like faith there, and obtained a copy of Dobney's work, &c. This gave me a new start; and I then determined to subscribe for your paper, but still found in me an unwillingness to let it be known that I held such views. So I have neglected for months until now. I now feel determined fully to satisfy myself about this faith; and if it be the truth, to bear witness to it, if all my brethren and sisters around me despise me for the same.

One thing I used to dread. I somehow thought that if I embraced the doctrine of the destruction of the wicked, I should lose the vital religion out of my soul; but in this, I am happy to think, I was mistaken. I think it will have a tendency to make one love that good and benevolent Being who witholds eternal life from those whom it would make miserable.

Again, I used to think that this doctrine would do for a Christian to entertain, but he must keep it to himself, (as I have done,) and not tell it to sinners, as it would wrap them in greater security in their sins; but I begin to see that this is a mistake of mine, and that if this is the truth, it can do no harm, but great good to proclaim it. But as I wish to be fully satisfied, I have written to you for more light, and hope to get it in due time.

—o—

FROM ISRAEL ALDEN.

*Bath, Steuben Co., N. Y., April* 27th, 1851.

BRO. STORRS:—I feel as though I would be glad to tell you how much I value your excellent paper, coming as it does ladened with rich food for the mind (*not immortal*) *grasping after truth.* Let me have the truth, although I have to suffer in person or *character* in the estimation of the world and persecuting church. I should be glad to send you something to help you in publishing this precious truth of immortality through Christ, but my brother, I have to wade through deep waters. I have six in my family to support with the labor of my hands, which thank the Lord I am enabled to do and find a little time with the help of your invaluable paper to prepare to *give* meat in due season to the household of faith. Jesus was despised and rejected of men—a man of sorrow and acquainted with grief, but he overcame, and we have the assurance that in due time we shall reap it if we faint not; then courage, brother, the *rapping* devils are all around us here. The wide-spreading deception is working the ruin of thousands. But we are not ignorant of the device of the devil—let us beware of the snares, that that day do not overtake us as a thief. I see a great deal of truth in your article on 2 Thess. 2—the revelation of the Man of Sin. Surely the rapping spirits have exalted themselves already above all that is called God or worshipped—setting aside the word of truth, assuming to present communications of a "higher character" than any that have ever preceded the present developements.

The signs thicken—the evidences accumulate around us almost every hour. O! may we be ready and waiting; may the Lord help us to be diligent, that we may be found of him in peace, without spot and blameless before Him at His coming. I feel that the grand crisis is near; the morn of Zion's glory will soon dawn on the long dark night of death's dominion, and we shall behold Him, the Star of Israel's hope—the nucleus of all perfection—the grand centre from which radiates every ray of light, glory and consolation to the stricken flock. O! the crown, *the crown* that is incorruptible: 'tis yours—'tis mine. Onward, onward, then 'tis rictory or DEATH.

Yours, waiting for immortality.

—o—

FROM GEO. W. BROWN.

*Richmond, Me.,* April, 1851.

BRO. STORRS:—The doctrine of no immortality out of Jesus Christ seems to be gaining ground in this region. Several have lately embraced it in Bowdoinham, where I have been preaching for a few weeks past. What first led them to look at the subject was

the Examiner, which was sent to Charles Dinsmore, who had been a believer for several years. Every opportunity he had he would throw in objections against the doctrine of immortal-soulism; and occasionally would get them to read an Examiner which led them at last to inquire, "Are these things so?" The more they investigated the more they were convinced that life and immortality are brought to light through the gospel, and given only to those "who by patient continuance and well doing, *seek for*" *it.* I have had meetings in that vicinity occasionally for a year past; but there has not appeared to be much interest until four or five weeks ago, when we commenced a protracted meeting. Then the interest increased very fast. Several backsliders were reclaimed, and there was a general revival among those that professed to love God. One man, a professed Universalist, has also embraced the truth. It appears he was converted when quite young, and afterwards seeing the doctrine of eternal torments was inconsistent with the character of God, and supposing that or Universalism must be true, he embraced the latter; but when he was shown from the Bible that God would destroy all the wicked, root and branch, he concluded that must be true, embraced it, and confessed he was a pilgrim and stranger on the earth, looking for eternal life when Jesus comes. I am satisfied the only thing that will keep the honest from embracing this truth is to keep them from looking at it. Hence the cry is raised, "Annihilation," "Infidelity," &c., to frighten people and keep them from examining the Bible to see whether these things are so; but, thank God, we are in the time of the end, and knowledge is increasing and will increase until the Lord comes.

Yours, in hope of eternal life.

—o—

From R. T. Harman.

*Walnut Hills, Cincinnati, Ohio.*

Br. Storrs:—I have been reading Andrew Jackson Davis on the Philosophy of Spiritual Intercourse. He leaves the Bible far behind, toiling after him in vain. He lays the resurrection on the shelf—or rather calls the emancipation of the spirit from the body at death, the resurrection. According to him, no soul can ever be lost, and Christ's death, consequently, can be of no avail to any man.

—o—

A Union Conference will be held at Nankin, Michigan, June 27, and continue over the Lord's day following. Br. Joseph Marsh, from Rochester, New York, is expected to be present, and a number of preachers from different parts of Michigan. The place of meeting is about five miles from Wayne Depot, and four from Plymouth Village. It is hoped there will be a general rallying of the friends; and that they will come prepared to help forward the work.

—o—

The Christian Truth-Seeker, No. 2, has been sent to all the subscribers for the Bible Examiner in the United States, who have *paid* for the latter paper for 1851, and to a few who have not. We have done this with the hope that they will either become paying subscribers to the new paper, or induce some of their neighbors to do so. But if they do not choose to do either, they need not *return* it, as we shall make no charge to such persons for the two numbers sent and shall not send them again.

"Christian Psalmody: or *Psalms and Hymns* for the use of all Christians." This is the title of a small Hymn Book, containing 205 select and choice Psalms and Hymns purged of sectarianism, intended to help Christians to sing with the understanding as well as in the spirit. The price hereafter, will be, in paper covers, 12½ cents, or 12 copies for one dollar; bound in plain morocco 20 cents, with one-third off to those who buy to sell again; in plain gilt, 25 cents, or five copies for $1; gilt *extra*, 37½ cents, or three copies for $1. The name of the purchaser will be put on the cover in gold leaf for $12½ cents, if desired; but this will be in all cases an extra charge.

—o—

John Adams was at one time called upon by some one to contribute to foreign missions, when he abruptly answered, "I have nothing to give for that purpose, but there are here in this vicinity, six ministers, not one of whom will preach in each other's pulpit. Now I will contribute as much, and more than any one else, to *civilize* these clergymen."

—o—

Truth.—"The doctrine of the *'literal destruction'* of the wicked is but an old doctrine revived."—*An Independent Bishop.*

Exactly; it is as old as the Bible, where it has lain obscured but too long by the rubbish of heathen "philosophy, *falsely* so called."—*Dr. Lee's (British) Truth Seeker.*

—o—

The following was communicated by an unknown hand, accompanied by substantial evidence of a determination to help us, viz: with $5. The donor will please accept our thanks.—Editor.

## ACROSTIC.

Hark!—what friendly voice is that I hear?
Enduring accents! 'Tis the theme of Love!
What kind appeals—what admonitions too!
How well designed, to search and prove the heart.
Our fair exterior—will nought avail;
Love makes the heart its residence, and moves
Our deepest sympathies for others' woes—
Visits the widow and the fatherless—
Extends to the afflicted kind relief.
The poor, the outcast, the despised, oppressed,
Hardly can fail in such to meet a friend:
Governed by principles which love inspires—
Our joy will be in making others bles't
Doeth selfish ends—our private actions sway.
Look deep within! if we love God, we love
Our Brother too—renouncing self; if not—
Vain are our gifts, our knowledge, faith or hope!
Empty'd of self—with love imbued—how sweet,
To do and say—as Jesus did and taught;
His sojourn here hath mark'd the path in which
He fain would have us go—tracing his steps;
In all our words and actions prove our love
Sincere, made pure and like our glorious Head.
Behold! His day makes haste! 'tis at the door!
Rejoice and be exceeding glad. He comes—
Our elder brother—friend! and comes to reign.
Taught by the signs he kindly gave—we know
His day already hath begun to dawn;
Expecting soon to hail the Prince of Peace,
Rejoice in hope of everlasting life.
And shall we shrink from duty? Shun the cross?
Love will be active—bent on doing good!
Such is the God-like character of Love;
Oh! that the spark might soon become a flame!

April 13, 1851.

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VI. PHILADELPHIA, JULY, 1851. NO. 7.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,

At 68 North Eighth Street, between Arch and Cherry,

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

**TERMS.**—Single copy, for one year, $1; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; always in advance.


## LIFE IN CHRIST.

BY EDWARD WHITE, ENGLAND.

[Continued from page 84.]

It is alleged that the view here given of the work of Redemption, diminishes the glory of Christ, and the value of his "precious blood," and the "exeeeding sinfulness of sin." In other words, it is assumed that the divine atonement implies that sin deserves an *infinite* punishment; and that the ordinary representation as to the metaphorical signification of the death threatened to Adam, and by him entailed upon his posterity, tends to the aggrandizement of the benefits of Christ's intervention and salvation, much more than the view which would exhibit Him as the Restorer of immortal life and glory to a world which had lost them.

Now, in reply, we reverently submit, in the first place, that the suffering which Jesus bore was not infinite; it was a certain definite amount of evil which he graciously endured—"*a cup*" which his Father gave him, not an *ocean* of woe: and the indwelling of the Godhead rendered that suffering effectual as a propitiation. If the punishment of sin must needs be infinite, it follows that the Lord Jesus did not bear the curse of the law. But we have already seen that he did: therefore a finite punishment is commensurate with the "exceeding sinfulness of sin."

Secondly, we presume to suggest, that the Christian theologian is not called to construct a scheme of redemption which he may pronounce to be glorious; but to ascertain from the inspired authority exactly what *the facts* of that case are, on which the divine system of mercy is founded. As far back as the days of Job, there were to be found persons guilty of the officious temerity in religious discourse, which led them to exalt some one characteristic of the Deity, at the expense of the rest, under a false supposition of its being the "darling attribute;" and even to advance so far as to "speak wickedly for God, and to tell a lie to gratify him." Perhaps many others, besides the worst of mankind, are in a similar danger in more recent times: and surely when we reflect upon "our ignorance of the Divine Majesty, which is so profound, as to render such daring presumption equally profane in relation to every one of the attributes of God," we shall discover an additional reason for confining our speculations within the strict limits prescribed by the written word. "*Add thou not unto his words*, lest thou be found a liar."

The notion that the value of Christ's sacrifice depends upon the circumstance of mankind being by nature subject to everlasting misery, through Adam's sin—evidently proceeds upon the previous assumption of that circumstance as a truth. But where is the evidence of this assumption? It appears to consist solely in the *assertion* that man was created with an immortal soul, and that the death threatened to Adam involved and implied an eternity of misery. We have seen, however, in contradiction to this theory, that the Scripture is destitute even of a single declaration of man's natural immortality; that, on the contrary, the name conferred upon Adam in the day of his creation was intended explicitly to forbid the conception that he took rank, as to his essential duration, above the surrounding animal population of the world;—we have seen that the Scripture contemplates *man* as a being compounded of body and spirit; but fixes upon the flesh as the characteristic "image;"—we have seen that there is no probability that Adam could have understood the threatening of Death held out to himself in any other sense than that in which he had seen "*death* pass upon" the inferior races around him, and that therefore there is a *prima facie* improbability against the theory which would interpret the term by the idea of everlasting existence in misery:—we have seen, that the sacred writer, in narrating the fact that the curse was incurred, offers not one word indicative of his belief, or of Divine authority for the belief, in this, which must have been, if it were true, by far the most tremendous element of the calamity:—we have seen that the scriptural account of the constitution of man is opposed to the doctrine which would represent the curse of the law, any more than the blessing of the gospel, as directed to the spirit apart from the body; and that so far from regarding the soul as a separate subject of punishment, the curse did not even contemplate its survivance at all:—and lastly, we have seen that the apostolic argument upon the entrance of death, is couched in such phraseology as to oblige us to receive the literal acceptation of that term as the true signification of the threatening—if we would avoid the otherwise inevitable blasphemy (shall we say?) of the proposition, that the sin of Adam was followed up by the infliction of interminable suffering upon the spirits of infants who died during the period that elapsed from Adam to Moses.

If, then, the assumption on which the objection before us rests be untenable, as it seems assuredly to be, the principle founded upon that assumption is also untenable. There appears to be not the slightest evidence for the doctrine that immortal existence in misery was the curse of the law, as we have recently attempted further to demonstrate by the argument derivable from the *death* of the Saviour; and therefore all representations based upon such a doctrine must be utterly vain. Thus our first reply to the objection that the views contended for diminish the glory of Christ, is to the following effect: that the true glory of Christ may be best ascertained by investigating the nature of the *facts* upon which the scheme of Redemption is based; and that since those facts do not warrant us in declaring eternal existence in misery to have been the curse of the law under which Adam and his posterity came, the declara-

tion that Christ's mediation has for its object the restoration of the hope of immortality to the world is the most consistent with his honor and the most fitted to attest the value of his blood.

But some there are, who modify the foregoing proposition contended against;—holding that, although Adam incurred *for himself* death of the body, *and eternal misery of the soul,* he incurred only death of the body for his posterity; while they, through their own corrupt nature, exhibiting itself in actual sins, incur everlasting misery *for themselves;*—and that *thus* the glory of Christ shines forth as before, as the Saviour of men from interminable suffering in hell. But, in answer, we venture to object, in the *first* place, that here, as in the former case, the immortality of the soul is taken for granted, in the instance of Adam, and requires to be proved. *Secondly*, it seems to be a very arbitrary mode of dealing with scripture to declare that *Death "in both its senses,"* or both of its reputed significations, descended upon *Adam* for his sin, and yet that death in only one of its senses descended upon his *posterity;*—and this, notwithstanding the Apostle's declaration that "death passed upon all men," in a sentence where he gives not the least indication of any difference in the penalties incurred and endured by Adam and his descendants. Rom. v. 12–14. Surely, if the term *Death* stands for two such distinct, opposite, awfully (we might say infinitely) different ideas, as destruction of the body, and *endless* existence of the spirit in "tribulation and anguish," we might have expected that the sacred penman would have afforded some faint intimation, at least, of the transition from one idea to the other. But he contents himself with declaring that "by sin *death* entered into the world through one offence;"—and then proceeds to point out the fact that *death* reigned over even the *personally inn oeent* from Adam to Moses. This looks very much, we think, as if Paul knew but one definition of death.

Admitting, however, for a moment the two significations of the word, who does not perceive that those who hold with the duplicate meaning lay themselves open to the following inquiry:—If, on your own showing, death, as it reigned from Adam to Moses, signifies literal death, common dissolution, decease; why may not death signify, as we assert, exactly the same thing in the instance of Adam himself? and, by a parity of reasoning, in the cases of those who have sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression? For there is precisely the same amount of evidence to prove that *death*, from Adam to Moses, signified or involved an immortality of suffering for the soul, as there is to show that it portended that destiny, in the case of Adam himself:—and if you admit, through a horror of the otherwise inevitable conclusion, that death, as it reigned over infants, was only "temporal death," are you not driven into the additional conclusion, that death signified exactly the same thing, and nothing else, for the father of mankind, the original offender?

In other words, there appears to be no admissible argument for limiting, in any way, the signification of *death* as it reigned over infants from the Fall to the era of Moses; and, therefore, the theory which defines this term to signify immortality of the soul in suffering in *any* case, must consent to endure the necessary odium of thus defining it everywhere;—and thus, must accept either the literal meaning of the curse in the instance of Adam, or the unwelcome and burdensome doctrine of the descent of the curse not only of "temporal death," but of everlasting misery for the soul, to be inflicted on every one of the personally innocent infants who have died from the beginning of the world. And it will not suffice to assert, in order to diminish this odium, that the salvation of Christ is available for all such innocent infants, since, in the first place, that bold declaration is nowhere very explicitly set forth in the scripture; and secondly, the apology leaves the grand difficulty unremoved, since the astounding position will remain, that, had not Christ died to redeem them, they might, in perfect consistency with God's justice and mercy, have been condemned to endure the unutterable penalty under sentence of which they are supposed to be born.

To sum up these statements:—the present objection founds altogether upon the unproved assumption of human immortality;—and secondly, it proceeds upon an arbitrary principle of interpretation which lays the whole theory of a complex death open to a fatal overthrow, through a counter-employment of its own concession as to one signification of the term. Or, taking the other branch of the dilemma, if the glory of Christ depends upon the fact, that he saves men from death in its complex acceptation of mortality and everlasting misery of the soul—that glory can only be ascribed to him (consistently with the fair rules of interpretation,) through a previous representation as to the results of the fall upon the personally innocent, which is apparently felt and acknowledged to be, by *these* objectors, (though not by the former class,) an outrage upon the moral character of God.

But, indeed, it matters little which form of the preceding objection is adopted:—since, although it may appear, on a superficial view of the case, less injurious to Divine goodness to assert that men are born into the world liable only to "temporal death" for Adam's sin, than to declare that they are born liable to everlasting misery for it;—a closer inspection of the theory will tend somewhat to dispel the illusion, and to reveal features nearly equally forbidding. For the same divines who decline to represent the awful inheritance of everlasting misery of the soul, as descending upon the race for the transgression of Adam, do yet maintain that his descendants are born with a corruption of nature which *infallibly* leads them to the commission of crimes deserving that everlasting consignment to misery. So that in point of fact, Adam did transmit to his posterity, if not the formal inheritance of that destiny, yet a nature that contained a principle of evil which rendered it ultimately inevitable. Between this theory, therefere, and the ordinary (might we not say the more consistent) on , which openly maintains the transmission of the curse of immortal despair, there seems to be but little to choose.

And now, further, in reply to them both, and in reply to the statement that such views set forth the glory of Christ, and the value of his sacrifice; measuring the value of that sacrifice not by the infinite blessedness procured, but by the infinity of suffering supposed to be incurred by Adam for himself and his posterity: we proceed to advance the directly contradictory position, that *the views now contended for glorify Christ's salvation the most.*

For we need not be afraid to assert, that, by how much *grace* is more glorious than *justice,* by so much more does that view of Christ's work glorify Him, which represents it as the restoration, by free gift, of immortal life to the world which had lost it in Adam, than that which declares that He came to deliver us from an infinite penalty, incurred through no fault of our own. Let any man consider, even in the most transient exercise of reflection, the proposi-

tion, that the fall of Adam brought upon himself, for "one offence," an inconceivable eternity of suffering, and brought the same penalty upon us, whether by mere imputation, or by the inevitable consequence of a corrupt nature transmitted to us, or by the unavoidable possession of immortality,—and say whether the provision of some such scheme as the gospel does not appear to be imperatively demanded by rigid *equity*. Yes; had it pleased the Almighty to bring such a race into existence *under the circumstances supposed*, the bestowment of redemption upon the victims of the unheard of calamity would assume an aspect of bare and simple *righteousness:* and the withholding of such a system of salvation would have been (if we may for one moment reluctantly utter the dreadful hypothesis,) to lay the Divine government open to the darkest suspicions of all minds constituted like our own. For aught that we can see, the universe might have built an altar *"to the unknown God;"*—since, although no creature should have dared to charge *wrong* upon the Author and Fountain of Law, would it not have been forever impossible intelligently to reconcile the commandments and the proceedings of the Omnipotent? If He, who kindles the flames of hell in defence of that LAW which is fulfilled in love, should have thus deliberately brought an entire race into an immortal existence of misery from which there was no escape, either through free-will or redemption, surely it is not presumptuous to declare that those voices must have been struck dumb which proclaim that *"the whole earth is full of his glory."* Whatever, therefore, might have been the expense at which the deliverance must have been effected, so far as we are capable of employing the moral judgment which God has repeatedly appealed to in scripture as a correct rule of decision, the deliverance of them was demanded by that common justice, the absence of which is the very definition of the character of a tyrannical despot. *Grace* could have had but a small share in the work of human salvation.

Yet is it an undoubted fact, that the Apostles represent the Gospel of God as displaying "the riches of his forbearance;" as illustrating "the glory of his grace;"—and hence we conclude that the sin of Adam *could not* have procured, at least for his posterity, the consequences usually alleged. Those views of the fall, and of redemption, for which we have argued, do, however, answer to the whole "length and breadth, and depth and height" of the apostolic declarations. If man was not created immortal; if Adam lost the prospect of immortality and glory both for himself and his descendants; if the "redemption which is in Christ Jesus" be regarded as the free gift of righteousness and of life eternal to a world which has forfeited all claim upon them, or upon the divine goodness forever;—then, indeed, the Gospel of Christ appears before us in an effulgence of majestic *grace*, fitted to supply a theme of endless wonder and adoration, at once to the race whom he saves, and to the whole intelligent universe. Under this view, the person of the Saviour becomes radiant with "a light above the brightness of the sun," as *the Author and Giver of immortality*, and attracts towards Himself the boundless unbroken tide of human affection through time and eternity. Under this view, it is also the glory of God which appears in the face of Christ Jesus; and we are not summoned to render homage to the Son for rescuing us from *an original constitution* of things, which invests the character of the Father in the blackest mystery and gloom. Under this view, the believer finds himself to be attached to his gracious Redeemer by closer than moral ties. He is Christ's—not by salvation from an eternal slavery, but by re-creation. He is indebted to Him not merely for pardon, but for existence itself; not merely for peace, but for the possibility of being at all, Under this view the Church is indeed the bride of the Lamb; the offspring of his own vitality; the Eve of the second Adam; "a member of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones;" and we discern a fresh argument for "yielding ourselves unto Him as those who are alive from the dead," and for glorifying God with our bodies, *and our spirits*, which are his. "We thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead: and that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them and arose again." The language of the Christian will be, "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me. And the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me. *I do not frustrate the grace of God*," either by an exaggerated representation of the original curse, which would convert that grace into justice, or by an attempt to gain righteousness through the works of the law.

Thus, with the Bible, would we endeavor to demonstrate that mankind, by nature, is allied, in degradation and mortality, to the lower orders of creation, and thus would we exalt the person of the Divine Redeemer as ALL IN ALL, and LIFE ETERNAL, to the *"son of man which is a worm."*

[To be continued.]

## THE FUTURE STATE.

BY REV. REGINALD COURTENAY, A. M.

During 1849, we gave a number of extracts from the writings of Mr. Courtenay, on the "Intermediate State," which we know were read with much interest. We have concluded to resume our extracts from this author. Those we are now to make are more of a philosophical character, and will go to show that the *future existence* of man, in happiness or misery, is not discoverable by human reason, but is discoverable *only* by revelation. Thus we shall be led to see the immense value of revelation, and the folly of most ministers who leave revelation to waste their strength in mere philosophical labor, to prove man immortal: all such labor is descending from their high calling to meet Sanballat, Geshem, and other mockers of the religion of the Bible "in the plain of Ono," where they are sure to have "mischief" inflicted on themselves. If the Bible does not reveal a future state and its nature, in vain shall we search for it in philosophical arguments; for the world by wisdom knew not God, and never can learn whether there be a future state at all, much less what is its nature. This we trust will be made apparent by the extracts we shall give from this English work by Courtenay:

### PHYSICAL EVIDENCES OF A FUTURE LIFE.

*On the Dependence of the Human Mind on the Body—and on Sleep.*

The opinion that the soul will continue to exist, and will experience no diminution, at least, of its

powers, after the dissolution of the body which ensues on death, has been maintained, without any aid from Scripture, or from any moral considerations, chiefly upon the two following grounds. Its independence of the body; as being an immaterial thing, which cannot possibly owe its existence to any arrangement or structure of material senseless particles;—and its essentially indestructible nature; as being one and indivisible, and therefore incapable of dissolution or decay, or indeed of any change whatever.

The object of this first, and of several following chapters is, to show that granting the immateriality of the soul, a connection with the body, such as we know to exist during life, however incomprehensible the nature of the connection may be, as apparently essential to *the exercise of* any of the mental functions; and in the latter part of the book it is argued that even if consciousness, and the subject in which it resides, be indivisible, and be indestructible, consciousness is nevertheless capable of *complete suspension*, and probably will be completely suspended by, and after, death.

In reference to the first point Bishop Butler, the most successful of all vindicators of the reasonableness of the Gospel dispensation, has argued, and justly enough, that *if* death and the dissolution of the body* do not *of themselves* destroy our capacity for thought and action, we may reasonably expect to retain it through and after death. That death does not destroy them would certainly be a "sufficient reason" for supposing them to survive. And many facts have been brought forward, by Butler, and by other writers, with a view to show that death does not in any way destroy this capacity. Matter, it is observed, is universally, under every form and in every modification, inert and insensate; no commixture of elements, however subtle, no organization, however complicated, can impart to it motion or life. These are derived from the soul, the body being merely the means by which we perceive and act upon external things. How then, it is argued, can the dissolution of these elements, or the breaking up of this structure, destroy or impair the soul? Now not to call in question, in this place, the justice of the assumption, that man—mind and body—is nothing beyond an aggregation of passive particles, and an indivisible soul; it can only be replied that our inability to explain *how* the body can influence the soul at the time of death must not be permitted to create any doubt that such an influence is *possible*, unless we are also entitled to doubt that the mind and body reciprocally influence one another *during life*, because we are unable to give any account of the mode by which that influence is maintained. The language of some writers is such, indeed, as to go far towards denying this connexion and influence, at least that of body on mind, altogether. Dr. Butler calls consciousness one and indivisible, and argues that it is therefore indissoluble, imperishable, unchangeable: and further says that the subject in which consciousness resides, the mind, must be so too. Is then the mind, the whole mind, *unchangeable?* This it seems would naturally follow.

And Lord Brougham speaks of the mind, as continuing *the same*, from youth to old age, amidst all the changes of the body, "without shadow of turning." Now there *may be* some inmost essence of soul, some *consciousness of consciousness*, which remains the same during all the *waking* hours at least, of a man's life. And there may be, *beyond* this, some faculty of consciousness, which remains the same during the profoundest sleep, the most utter insensibility, and which even death will not destroy. But however this be, it is certain that the mind does possess and exert powers at one time, which it does not possess, or (which is practically just the same thing) cannot exert, at another; and is, in a perfectly intelligible sense, the most changeable thing we know. And are we to reject all that is changeable; and having thus reduced the mind as it were to the skeleton of its former self, call man an immortal being? Such an existence would be of no value; it would be a virtual death. Unless not merely the faculty of consciousness, but all or a considerable portion of the active and ever varying energies of the mind, remain entire and unimpaired after the dissolution of the body, nothing remains worth contending for. And the question now to be considered is, whether there is, or is not, so close a connexion between mind and body, as that the latter is essential, if not to the bare existence of mind in the abstract, at least to the *exercise* of the mental functions. The practically important question is, not whether any *capacity for* thought, but whether any thoughts, will survive the death of the body; or whether they will not "all perish, when man returns to his earth."

There are many facts, familiarly known, and indeed matters of universal experience, which very strongly show, that the mind, however distinct it may be in nature from the body, closely sympathizes, and co-operates with it: and further, that this co-operation is *mutual;*—that as mind is necessary to produce corporeal activity, so also is body to produce mental activity. Mind by itself, or we should rather say, the human mind, as at present constituted, is no less *insensate* than matter. Sensation is an attribute, (let the shrinking of the tentacles of the polype when touched be the illustration and proof of this) is an attribute of *mind* AND *matter*, residing in neither alone. And in like manner, as a vast number of facts go to prove, is mental activity, generally, inseparable from corporeal.

A stunning blow on the head renders the mind as inert and insensate, (and as unconscious too, notwithstanding the indivisibility of consciousness) as the weapon that inflicted the injury.

After certain intervals of action and excitement, our bodies imperatively require rest; of which they cannot be deprived either by sickness, or by excitement continued from external influences, for any considerable time, without suffering great and sometimes permament injury. And it seems that the repose is incomplete, and the body imperfectly recruited, unless the mind partake, in some degree at least, in this inactivity; and, as if withdrawn from the body, cease not only from controling the movements of the limbs, but from all sympathy with all consciousness of whatever may affect the organs of sense. How far the other powers of the mind, such as memory, imagination, reason, and others, partake in the common lethargy of the body and of the mental powers of perception and voluntary motion, it is impossible for us to discover with certainty. Any one who pleases may assert, that the mind is as active as ever, although we have no recollection of our sleeping thoughts, our dreams. But this want of recollection affords at least a presumption, either that the impressions made during sleep are extremely feeble, or that no ideas whatever pass through the brain during the greater part of our sleeping hours.

* These are not the same thing; but one the cause of the other; as will be hereafter further considered. This has been generally overlooked: and has led to much and serious misrepresentation.

For when we are awake, the distinctness of our recollections is very nearly in proportion to the force and depth of the original impressions; and beyond this, seems to depend on no other cause than the degree of *exclusive attention* with which they have been entertained. Now when our bodies are awake, and we are experiencing fresh sensations almost every instant, our attention, it would seem, must be more distracted than during sleep. How is it, then, that we do not recollect? If the mind is so independent of the body, as some persons would believe, what is there in the transfer from a waking to a sleeping state of body, or the reverse, that should interrupt the current of our recollections in a greater degree, that when one exchanges rest for activity, or activity for rest, *without* waking or falling asleep?

But we do sometimes remember our sleeping thoughts, our dreams. And they are, in general, as faint, as evanescent, and as confused as the images which float before our eyes when we close them in composing ourselves to rest: and are so easily banished by the most trivial waking thoughts as these images are by the admission even of faint light.* Moreover, it appears that dreams never take place during *deep* sleep; but only when the body is disturbed; is, like the mind, in a state between sleeping and waking, and acts, like the mind, feebly, irregularly, and involuntarily. Lord Brougham has mentioned in his Discourse on Natural Theology several curious facts—and Abercrombie, in his work on the Intellectual Powers, gives some similar instances, to show that an exceedingly short space of our sleeping time is occupied by dreams, even when to the dreamer himself many hours, or even days, seem to have elapsed. In many cases a sudden sound, or some painful sensation, both rouses the sleeper to his full consciousness, and before awaking him, suggests a long train of ideas; which must all, from the nature of the case, have passed through the mind in the space of a few seconds only.† "There seems every reason to conclude from these facts," he adds, "that we only dream during the instant of transition into and out of sleep. That instant is quite enough to account for the whole of what appears a night's dream. It is quite certain we remember no more than ought, according to these experiments, to fill an instant of time; and there can be no reason why we should only recollect this one portion, if we had dreamt much more. The fact that we never dream so much as when our rest is frequently broken, proves this almost to demonstration. An uneasy and restless night passed in bed is always a night studded full with dreams. If it be said we always or generally dream when asleep, but only recollect a portion of our dream, then the question arises, why we recollect a dream each time we fall asleep, or are awakened, and no more? If we can recall twenty dreams in a night of interrupted sleep, how is it that we can only recall one or two when our sleep is continued? The length of time occupied by the dream we recollect is the only reason that can be given for our forgetting the rest; but this reason fails, if, each time we are roused, we remember separate dreams."

If, then, we are absolutely without thoughts, during life, except when the communication between the mind and the body is, more or less perfectly, kept up, may we not conclude that death, which interrupts that communication much more completely, destroys the power of thought? It may be said that this conclusion is opposed by the fact, that the velocity of thought is greater in dreams, when the body is only partially awake. But this velocity has certainly been much overestimated; and notwithstanding the facts above alluded to, of persons being awakened by the very same sensation, commencing very shortly before they were fully awakened, that suggested a dream, it is *highly* probable that thought is on these occasions not more rapid than when the mind is in a state of excitement during our wakening hours. This it is thought the following observations will render very evident.

Any one who will consider the nature of the impression produced upon his mind, by merely reading or hearing, in any real or fictitious narrative, of a *lapse of time*, or even by barely imagining such a lapse, must be aware that the mind is capable of transferring itself from one period to another, and getting a general notion that a long interval has had place between them, without there actually passing through the mind *the thousandth part of the number of ideas* which would successively occupy it if that space of time were actually lived over. It is very true that we measure time, as it passes, by the continuous flow of ideas through the mind, and that if the rapidity of thought be really capable of an indefinite increase, it is perfectly possible that a single hour might be, to the individual, practically equivalent to all the remaining hours of his life put together: but in recollecting or imagining a lapse of time, we do not revive in our minds the whole current of ideas, but think only of a few of the more prominent; or even without any aid from them, think only of the general impression which the passage of the current has left, or would leave, on our minds. Any one who is fully awake can, in a few moments, without any extraordinary exertion of thought, imagine himself, or any other person, to be in a considerable number of positions in the world in succession. Any one familiar with the original description of them, could probably think over Shakspeare's Seven Ages of Man in less than as many seconds. Now if these occurred to him in a dream, he would,—it is almost invariably the case—imagine that he himself was the subject that acted or suffered, and passing naturally—for all things, however strange, in dreams seem perfectly

*If, when the eyes are closed in a dark room, and the mind is calm, any faint streaks of light, specks, or figures seem to float upon the dark stream, these may be made to assume the shape of almost any object, especially of a brilliant one, to which the thoughts are steadily directed. After becoming distinctly visible for a few seconds, the object will generally pass off into another nearly similar: and when the eyes are familiar with the mode in which the transformations most naturally succeed one another, the figure may be changed, step by step, into nearly any other desired. Thus an arrow may be transformed into a fish, the fish into a leaf.

If, immediately on waking in a dark room, from a dream which presented any vivid scene to the eye of the imagination, the attention be turned to the spectre before the eyes, particular spots and streaks will be seen, *corresponding with the most prominent objects just before observed in the dream.* It is scarcely possible to avoid concluding, that dreams are owing to an excitement of the nerves of sensation, though of a very faint kind, during imperfect sleep—and that in *all* mental operations in which objects of sense are recollected, there is an action of the nerves, similar to that by which a knowledge of these objects was originally transmitted to the mind.

† Discourse on Natural Theology, Part i. Sec. v. But does it not still remain to be established, whether in fact it is not the dream suggested by the sound or sensation, not the sound or sensation itself, which, after the interval perhaps of several minutes, awakes the sleeper?

natural—from one age to another, would, if he were to awake immediately on concluding the series, imagine he had *just lived a life completely through.*"

* * * * *

We pass on now to the consideration of another class of facts, which furnish ground for a still stronger argument; and which show that the mind sympathises with the body in cases, which if not in ordinary language the same, are very nearly identical with death. In the case of what is commonly called a fainting fit, the powers of the body are partially suspended by a stupor which sometimes,—as in consequence, for example, of a great loss of blood from a wound,—terminates in death: and the power of the mind, as far as this can be decided from the total want of recollection at least, on the part of the sufferer, of any ideas during the state of corporeal stupor, are totally suspended. It is true that this is not always the case: but these exceptions are never found, except where the functions of the brain are unimpeded. In very many instances of mortal injury, whether produced by accident or disease, the vital powers may be seen gradually to sink, and attacks of total insensibility, mental and bodily, succeed one another more and more frequently, until at length the pulse ceases to beat, and the breath to ebb and flow. Is this cessation a symptom of increased energy of the mental functions, which just before were torpid, dormant, paralysed? The notion is really preposterous. Religious persons have indeed some reason to indulge a belief, that at this critical moment the liberated spirit of one whom they loved or revered wings its flight to heaven, and "wantons in endless being:" for there are many passages of Scripture which countenance such a belief; and to those who hang in sorrow over the couch of the departed it affords a consolation, to which nothing can be added but the hope that, after a few short years, they may rejoin those whom they have lost. And the same consolatory belief may be traced, here and there, in all ages and nations, but the most barbarous, among the priests and the common people, the poets and the philosophers; and for this belief there have been many different motives, some of which will be hereafter considered.* But from such of the phenomena of death as have just been alluded to, if *these alone* be considered, no other conjecture can be formed, but that opposite and more gloomy one, which also is most consonant with the dark forebodings natural to man, when oppressed by the sense of recent calamity, that DEATH IS A DREAMLESS SLEEP, a state in which ANIMATION IS WHOLLY SUSPENDED? The universal voice of mankind, (confirmed moreover, though this is to anticipate, by the declarations of Scripture) in according to the brutes no future state, has sanctioned this conclusion. For in the death of the lower animals we witness exactly the same decay of intelligence as in the death of man;—the phenomena differ in no respect whatever. The universal persuasion, therefore, of the mortality of all the inferior animals, shows that *considerations of another kind* have induced men to make a distinction in favor of their own species. It is thus with much probability made to appear that merely physical considerations are incapable of furnishing any hope of the survival of life and consciousness; which seem to be *so closely inherent in*, though forming no part of, the bodily frame, as to cease from all activity when that frame can no longer sympathize and co-operate with them.

Men have expected an immortality which they have denied to the brutes; but *not* because "mind has an inherent essential indestructibility," or because "consciousness is one and indivisible." There is scarcely any people to be found on earth in whose creed are not evident indications of an original correspondence with that favored race, to whom were committed the oracles of God: scarcely any people whom tradition has not taught, or rather admonished, to expect an existence beyond the grave. And some have been threatened by conscience with a retribution in another world; or Hope has pictnred to them a relief from the pressure of distress; or Affection has tempted them to follow the departed into the gloom of Hades, attributing to them there an existence at least as substantial as that of their imagined dwelling-place; or the manifold motives which conduce to polytheism have peopled the universe at first with beings of human attributes merely; then also with spirits of earthly origin. But still the minds of men continually recur to the belief, that when man returns to his earth, all his thoughts will perish; that there is no knowledge or understanding in the grave to which he hastens. And it can never be shown that this conclusion is adverse to Scripture, which assures men of a *resurrection of the body*, when life and consciousness are restored, at the time of the final award. "As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up; so man lieth down and riseth not; till the heavens be no more they shall not *awake*, nor be raised out of their *sleep*." "We shall not all *sleep*, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump."

* It should be kept in mind, that a real and practical difference exists, between a lively and a lifeless faith, equally in false religion and in the true. It is not enough that a people should possess certain traditionary or speculative doctrines concerning the departed; nothing short of a lively and operative faith in these doctrines (a thing surely not more common in heathen than in Christian lands) can raise men to the enviable condition of those who—to recognise the important historical testimony of St. Paul, "sorrow not, even as the rest, who have *no* hope."

## TRUE SOURCE OF IMMORTALITY.

It will be recollected by our readers that Br. Thos. Read, of New York, furnished a number of articles, on the above topic, which were coucluded in April. He has revised those articles and extended his remarks over twice the ground as before, and much of the new matter is of the most interesting character; many new topics being introduced and ably discussed. He has loaned us his manuscript and we have taken the liberty to give an extract from one of the new topics. It relates to the question, "*What is the image of God?*" as the fact that man was made in that image is supposed by many to be proof that man is immortal. Br. Read presents various views of the subject, and considers some of the difficulties of each. In the following remarks he presents the view that "God is a personal being," &c. He says:—

2. There are some who believe that God is a personal being, having locality and form, and that man was made in the form and likeness of God; even as the son of Adam was begotten in the image and likeness of Adam.

"Of the King of the ages, incorruptible, invisible, the only God," we desire to speak with the utmost reverence. We know no more of him, or of his nature, than he has been pleased to reveal; "but *things*

*that are revealed* belong to us and to our children." As we would not willingly propagate error, so neither would we countenance errors, even those of long standing. And as there are those who believe that God is a person, we shall bring forward some of the scriptures they adduce, leaving the reader to judge whether they establish the personality of God.

It is said that God is immaterial, that is, not consisting of matter of any kind. This we regard as equal to saying that God is nothing. We believe that every being in the universe is formed of something. But as no scripture teaches the immateriality of God, and as it is contrary to reason, we are bound to reject it. Incorruptibility, aphtharsian, is compounded of aph, *without*, and phtharsia, corruption, meaning without liability to decay, is ascribed to God in I Tim. 1: 17, and in Rom. 1: 23, and it is the very term applied to the spiritual—resurrection—and material *bodies* of the glorified saints, and is placed in strong contrast in Rom. 1: 23, and 1 Cor. 15, with the present corruptible bodies or persons we now possess. Incorruptibility, therefore, being ascribed to God, seems to have reference to the *spirit*, or other *material* of his nature, and is a term that, so far from indicating immateriality, is utterly inconsistent with it; and seems to have exclusive reference to the *quality* of *substance*. Spirit, oxygen, and electricity, are *incorruptible substances*. Spirit is certainly material.

It is said that "God is a Spirit." John 4: 24, reads in the translation from Griesbach, "God is spirit, and they that worship him must worship him *in spirit* and in truth." The *a* is not in the original, and we think it has been improperly added. We conceive Christ in this place to mean that God is an intelligent being, and must be worshipped with intelligence and sincerity. "God is light," and "God is love." Light we regard as figurative, implying unlimited intelligence; and love we believe to be the ruling principle of his moral nature. If the material of God's nature be spirit, it may be spirit in form. Spirit is matter, and it is incorruptible, a word that is inapplicable to anything that is not composed of matter. God is incorruptible, and he is *immortal, because* he is incorruptible. Man is corruptible, and man is necessarily mortal, because he is corruptible. Incorruptibility implies a substance capable of everlasting life—undecaying. But the same God who creates incorruptible beings, can certainly destroy them. The immortality of every incorruptible being is dependent upon the will of God. "As the *living* Father hath sent me, and *I live by the Father*, so he that eateth me, even *he* [*will*] *live by me.*" John 6: 57. No being has independent immortality except the Father. "God *only* hath immortality."

God maketh his angels *spirits*. Are they not all ministering *spirits?* We know that angels are *personal beings, having locality and form*, and they are termed spirits. When the saints are raised from the dust with incorruptible bodies, they will then "be equal to the angels;" and this *incorruptibility of nature*, which they, *for the first time, assume at the resurrection*, makes them immortal *by the will of God in Christ Jesus.*

That God has substance, materiality, may not only be gathered from the word incorruptible, and the word spirit, but is plainly stated in Heb. 1: 3. God has spoken to us by a Son, "who being the brightness of his glory, and the *express image of his person.*" King's translation. "Who being the splendor of his glory, and *the figure of his substance.*" Vulgate. "Who being a ray of his glory, and an *image of his* SUBSTANCE." Griesbach. "Who being the resplendent outbeaming of the essential glory of God, and the character or *impression of his* SUBSTANCE." Dr. Clark. That God has form and shape seems to appear by the expressions used in Phil. 2: 5, Christ, "being in the *form of God*, took upon himself the *form* of a servant, and was made in the *likeness of men.*" Now, it appears that in the same manner as Jesus the Christ was in the form, likeness and shape of men, so he was in the form, likeness and shape of his Father. In 2 Cor. 4: 4, and Col. 1: 15, we read that Christ is the image of God, and is an image of God. In John 14: 9, Christ declares, he that hath seen me hath seen the Father. He that hath seen Christ hath seen a perfect resemblance of the Father. There is a resemblance more or less perfect existing between the father and the son among men; the son developing the same predominating characteristics and external form displayed by the parents; and it is perfectly reasonable to suppose that the analogy would be preserved between God the Father and his Son Jesus Christ, who is declared to be the express image of his Father's person. "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father," are the words of Jesus Christ, and he is God's representative in all things.

That God has a personal form, a shape, and a certain locality, where he more particularly reveals his presence, appears probable from many scriptures. Deut. 4: 15, "Ye saw no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spake unto you in Horeb." Moses seems to imply that there was a similitude. But we see not how a different construction can be put upon Ex. 33: 18, than that God is a personal being. Moses said to the Lord, "I beseech thee show me thy glory. And he said, I will make all my goodness pass before thee, and I will proclaim the name of the Lord before thee, and will be gracious to whom I will be gracious and will shew mercy on whom I will show mercy. And he said, Thou canst not see my *face;* for there shall no man see me and live. And the LORD said, Behold, there is a place by me, and thou shalt stand upon a rock: and it shall come to pass, while my glory passeth by, that *I will put thee in a cleft of the rock; and will cover thee with my hand while I pass by:* and *I will take away my hand, and thou shalt see my back parts:* but my *face* shall not be seen. * * * And the LORD *descended in the clouds, and stood with him there*, and proclaimed the name of the Lord. And the *Lord passed by before him*, and proclaimed, The *Lord*, The *Lord*, merciful and gracious, long sufferings and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear [the guilty.]" Then it appears that God has a visible form, though invisible now; a face and form that will be revealed to the saints when they shall become immortal. Manoah understood God to be a personal being. Judges 13: 22. Daniel in vision saw the *Ancient of days*, and describes his personal appearance. 7: 9. "I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the *Ancient of days* did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool; his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire." Before this august Being was brought the Son of man to receive a glorious and everlasting kingdom. 22 v. *The Ancient of days* came with the saints. Isa. 6: 1, "*I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne*, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple. Above it stood the seraphim. * * Then said I, woe is me! * * for *mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of Hosts.* The heavens were opened to Ezekiel, and he saw visions of God. 1: 26, "And above the firmament that was over their heads was the likeness of a

throne, as the appearance of a sapphire stone: and upon the likeness of the throne was the likeness as the appearance of a man above upon it. And I saw as the color of amber, as the appearance of fire round about within it, from the appearance of his loins even upward; and from the appearance of his loins even downward, I saw as it were the appearance of fire, and it had brightness round about. As the appearance of the bow that is in the cloud in the day of rain, so was the appearance of the brightness round about. This was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the Lord. And when I saw it, I fell upon my face, and I heard a voice of one that spake. * * Thus saith the Lord God." Supposing this a vision, yet it was a vision of something that did exist, and indicates a locality where God dwells, and a personal shape.

The narration in Job seems to be utterly irreconcilable with the idea that God is equally present in every place; but favors the opinion of his personality and locality; and that he conducts his providential arrangements by "the angels of his who do his pleasure, hearkening unto the voice of his words;" and till Christ comes, permits evil angels to try men, that their true characters may be developed. We quote from Fry's translation, Job 1: 6, "And it was *the day* when the Sons of the Elohim *came to present themselves before Jehovah;* and the adversary came also among them. And Jehovah said unto the adversary, whence comest thou? And the adversary answered Jehovah, and said, from going round the earth and journeying thereon. V. 12. And the adversary *went out from the presence of Jehovah.*" The very same words are repeated in the next chapter.

It seems that there were certain specified regular days when the Sons of the Elohim gave an account of their proceedings, and appeared before Jehovah to receive their respective commissions. This enables us to understand the nature of the spirit that was employed, as represented in 1 Kings, 22: 19. Micaiah said, "Hear thou therefore the word of the Lord: *I saw the Lord sitting on his throne,* and all the host of heaven standing by him on his right hand and on his left. And the Lord said, Who shall persuade Ahab, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth-Gilead? And one said on this manner, and another said on that manner. And there came forth a spirit and stood before the Lord, and said, I will persuade him. And the Lord said unto him, Wherewith? And he said, I will go forth, and I will be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. And he said thou shalt persuade him, and prevail also: go forth and do so." It is a fearful thing to contemplate that *the devil is a personal being,* and is not yet bound, that he should not deceive the nations; and he may have a commission to those who receive not the truth in the love of it, and have pleasure in unrighteousness, to send upon them strong delusions, that they should believe a lie and be damned. But we proceed. Mat. 18: 10: "Look that ye despise not one of these little ones, for I say unto you; that their angels in heaven do always *behold the face of my Father* who is in heaven." They, like Gabriel, may be a part of the seven presence spirits of God. Luke 1: 19, "I am Gabriel that *stand* in the *presence of God.*" Mat. 5: 8, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall *see God.*" Heb. 12: 14, "Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall *see the Lord.*" Job 19: 26, "And though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet *in my flesh shall I see God.*" Perhaps some would translate this, "I shall see God of my flesh. I shall see Christ who has become bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh." David, addressing the God of providence, says, "Deliver my soul from the wicked, which have *their portion in this life.*" "As for me, I will *behold thy face* in righteousness. I shall be satisfied when *I awake* in thy likeness." Ps. 17: 15. David expected *his portion* at the resurrection, when he would see God. The phrases in the parables, Mat. 21: 48, and 22: 11, "When the Lord of the vineyard cometh." "And when the King came in to see the guests," seem to imply that God himself will be revealed. The Lord, and King, are here distinguished from the Son as a separate person.

It really does appear that when Christ comes, another person will be manifested, even the Father, and that then we may say, "Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and *he will dwell with them,* and they shall be his people, and *God himself* shall be *with them,* and be their God.'*i* Rev. 21: 3. "Keep this commandment without spot, unrebukable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, *which in his times he shall shew,* the blessed and only Potentate, the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords; *who only hath immortality,* dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto: whom no man hath seen, nor can see [and live;] to whom be honor and power everlasting. Amen." 1 Tim. 6: 14. We leave out the words "who is" added to the King's version, and add "and live," to harmonize with the other passages. "We should live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world, looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God, *and* our Saviour Jesus Christ." Tit. 2: 12. God is now invisible; then, it appears, he will be visible. Jesus said, "If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and *we* will come unto him and make our abode with him." John 14: 23.

These scriptures indicate the personality of God. Now, if God has form; then the image and likeness in which man was created, may mean external resemblance, which implies similarity of mental and moral organization. This allowed, and we can easily understand the following scriptures.

"And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him." "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be be shed; for in the image of God made he man." The image of God then was retained after man had sinned. 1 Cor. 11: 7, "For a man indeed ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God; but the woman is the glory of the man." Men "are made after the similitude of God."

These are objections to this theory, and let them be candidly examined. Prov. 15: 3, "The eyes of the Lord are in every place, beholding the evil and the good." Jer. 23: 23, "Am I a God at hand, saith the Lord, and not a God afar off? Can any hide himself in secret places that I shall not see him? saith the Lord? Do not I fill heaven and earth, saith the Lord?" Ps. 139: 7, "Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend into heaven, thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me. * * * Yea, the darkness hideth not from thee; but the night shineth as the day. The darkness and the light are both alike to thee." These are beautiful passages, and what do they mean? That all things are alike present to God; coming within his perfect knowledge, and being completely under his control; and not that God is everywhere present alike.

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, JULY, 1851.

FROM EDWARD WHITE, AUTHOR OF "LIFE IN CHRIST."—It gives us much pleasure to be able to present our readers with the following letter from Bro. White: and we do not know that it is much abatement to our satisfaction that he expresses a dissent from us on the state of the dead. We are fully agreed that eternal life and immortality are *only* in and through our glorious Lord Jesus Christ. While we regard that life as only *actually* conferred upon any *by* and *at* the resurrection, he regards it as inseparably connected with *present regeneration*, so that the *Christian* is in a state of consciousness *immediately* after death. His view in this respect is no bar in our mind to the most perfect fellowship and brotherly communion: nor have we ever felt to withhold Christian communion and sympathy from any Christians who disagree with us on the question, so long as they express their dissent in the same kind spirit that Bro. White has his on the state of the dead. Our columns are open to any of our friends on the other side of the Atlantic for a full presentation of their views on that question; and they may be assured we will endeavor to treat them wherein they may differ from us with Christian respect. Unless we are greatly mistaken, we are willing to be convinced of any error we may have fallen into. We know that truth alone can sanctify and make us free. If Bro. White has a suspicion that we are past being convinced of error in relation to the state of the dead, because, as an "editor" we have "committed" ourself, we cannot blame him for that suspicion, because such is *usually* the case with persons in that position; nevertheless, we trust for that grace whereby we may be able to show that it is not a *committal* to any doctrine that makes us adhere thereto, but a sincere belief of its truth and importance.

HEREFORD, England, May 21, 1851.

*To the Editor of the Bible Examiner:*

My dear Sir:—The arrival of another Bible Examiner reminds me that I onght before this to have acknowledged your kindness in regularly sending me copies of your little serial. It has been very pleasant, I assure you, to receive them as tokens of sympathy from across the water, and none who are interested in the doctrine of Life in Christ can fail to be gratified at learning that it has so vigorous an advocate in the States, and is making progress among American Christians. Above all, it is satisfactory to hear, as I lately had an opportunity of doing, that Bro. Storrs is a man valuing truth mainly from its tendency to produce heavenly goodness, and not battling away over a theological idea merely for glory or for victory. May we all, dear Brother, increasingly learn to dwell upon the practical side of truth, and on that indwelling of the Spirit of life, with his fruits, without which all our speculations on immortality will be in vain. "The world passeth away and the lust thereof; but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever." For us to live may it be Christ, and then to die will be gain.

The communications from my friends, Moncrieff and Dobney, in the present Examiner, I have read with interest. The letter of the latter recalls storms and struggles which we are beginning to forget. It pleases me to think that I had some hand in stimulating Brother Dobney to his reply to the Electic Review, which you know as his work on Punishment; especially as it has turned out that his thoughts have had so wide a circulation among you. I rejoice in the honor thus put upon him, for a more noble-spirited, unselfish man I never met with.

If I may venture one or two remarks on the Bible Examiner, in the most submissive spirit, confiding in your forbearance, you will confer a favor upon me. It is with continual sorrow of heart, then, that I see the unconsciousness of the soul after death made an essential article of faith among you, and thrust forth into first rate prominence. The criticism on which this your doctrine is based, is regarded by many, myself among the number, as one-sided and a little reckless—and although holding most firmly the main doctrine on Life, we hold that it is revealed with nearly equal clearness, that at least under the Christian dispensation some souls are conscious in the interval. We observe that you do not grapple with all the evidence. For example, you do not quote what I have said about it in "Life in Christ;" and I suspect that this is one principal reason why there is but little chance of that unfortunate volume ever getting as a whole before the eyes of your people. Now, you may be right, or I may be: but it seems most undesirable to exalt either doctrine concerning the state of the soul to a level with the main argument, especially since many of us who differ from yon on that doctrine, agree with you on the far more important matter of the premillenial advent of Christ. At least I do most heartily—though I fear my dear friend at Maidstone continues sceptical about it. Then again: Mr. Dobney, so far as I recollect, by no means commits himself to your theory of unconsciousness, but only shews how much may be said on both sides, thus evincing that it is a point on which we may differ, though maintaining other greater truths in common. I not only do not believe in the scriptural character of this theory, but venture to think that it is a considerable hindrance to the reception of our main doctrines, by those who are not Millenanians—for it is undoubted that it is your belief of Christ's speedy advent which permits you to look forward to your unconsciousness in such cool blood: and the great majority of Christians are bitterly opposed to these prophetic truths. You say

that you think I shall see reason to believe differently some day. I would return the conjecture, dear brother, did I not know that it is a very rare thing for editors who have committed themselves on any question to change their minds. Meantime I can only throw myself on your candor when I say that the whole tone in which this question is discussed has been very unsatisfactory to me. Most thoroughly do I agree with the Baptist brother, whose letter your recently printed, that the doctrine of unconsciousness should be left an open question, and is not at all necessary to the belief of Life in Christ principles.

Now, having discharged my conscience, permit me to express my humble admiration at the straightforward fearlessness, gravity, sincerity, with which you have hitherto conducted this controversy. The first enthusiasm of the matter has long since vanished from my mind, but all that I have read, seen, and heard, convinces me that we are doing a work, for which millions will bless God in eternity. We are illustrating the Divine attributes, in the divine method, and presenting a morally intelligible God to the hearts of the people—a God whom it is possible to love, admire and adore in the plain and literal sense of those words. We are showing that with Him there is awful justice and infinite love: and that in such a manner that every moral being can appreciate it. We are unveiling the inner glory of the Bible to the understanding of the saints, as it has long been revealed to their hearts. We are teaching a theology which it is possible to believe most heartily for all mankind, instead of teaching doctrines respecting the heathen world, which have driven myriads to the very verge of infidelity. We are showing the people a new glory in the Incarnation of the Life and Logos of God, and a new splendor and force in the doctrine of the indwelling of the life-giving, regenerating Spirit in the sons of God. We wield the most potent weapons against infidelity and Socinianism, and take the sword of the devil—infinite terror—out of the hand of Romanism. Then let us go on: preaching a real, a tremendous, a fiery tormenting pedition to the unconverted—an everlasting life in glory for all who are born again. No one has yet seen any practical bad results of these doctrines—and you and I have already seen many blessed ones. How pious men can read, for example, the sixth chapter of John's gospel, and resist this holy light, it is difficult to imagine—did we not know that most pious men have an exceeding suspicion of any doctrines which will assuredly expose them to the loss of their good name in a world that is inflated with infinite arrogance in the faith of its natural immortality. "How can ye believe which receive honor one of another?"

With earnest good wishes, dear brother, for your health and highest usefulness, and fraternal salutations to all to whom you have been kind enough to introduce my name,

Believe me very faithfully yours,

EDWARD WHITE.

EDITORIAL NOTE.—The "Volume" by Br. White, from which we are giving extracts in the Examiner, we should be glad to see published entire in this country, and think it would do immense good if it could be put into the hands of the Congregational and Presbyterian ministers here. Yet we have no means of publishing it; if we had, it should be done. We are compelled to content ourself with giving extracts.

———o———

WM. GLEN MONCRIEFF will please accept our thanks for the copy of his republication of Henry Grew's work on the "*Intermediate State.*" We sent Br. Moncrieff the work of Bro. Grew several months since, and we were truly glad to find that he had caused it to be reprinted in Scotland with "notes" and an "Appendix," making an addition of more matter than the origincl pamphlet contained; so that it makes a neat, closely printed pamphlet of 46 pages, 12mo. This pamphlet was received the next day after the foregoing letter from Bro. White, and after we had written our *prefatory* and *concluding* remarks to that letter. We supposed that Bro. Moncrieff still retained the view that the dead are conscious; but we loved him none the less on that account; nor do we Bro. White. We believed them both sincere inquirers after truth, and had little doubt they would be led to see, sooner or later, that the "resurrection of the *dead*" is incompatible with the idea of the consciousness of dead men.

It was several years after we had become interested in the truth of no immortality out of Christ, before we had even a suspicion that the dead were "*in silence*" and had "*no knowledge.*" Nor did we begin to see this point till after we had preached and printed the first edition of our "Six Sermons" on the "Inquiry, Are the Wicked Immortal?" And when the conviction first fastened upon us that we might have to take another step in so unpopular a doctrine as that we had begun to preach, it filled us with a spirit of recoiling; but when we saw that the Scriptures did testify that "*the dead praise not the Lord,*" and that "in sheol there is *no knowledge,*" with many other declarations of similar import, we bowed to what, it seemed clear to us, was *positive* testimony, while the opposite theory was only sustained by *inferences;* some of which, however, were plausible, though none were positive. This was a new trial, to take upon us an additional reproach, yet fully believing that our Lord and Master called us to it, we did not long shrink from lifting this cross also; and we have never soen an hour that we regretted having done so, though it has caused some to go back from an open avowal of their conviction of the literal death

een kind enough to

aithfully yours,
EDWARD WHITE.
ume" by Br. White,
cts in the Examiner,
lished entire in this
immense good if it
the Congregational
. Yet we have no
d, it should be done.
ourself with giving

-

please accept our
blication of Henry
'e State." We sent
rew several months
o find that he had
tland with "notes"
addition of more
t contained; so that
mphlet of 46 pages,
ived the next day
'o. White, and after
*concluding* remarks
Bro. Moncrieff still
are conscious; but
at account; nor do
m both sincere in-
doubt they would
t the "resurrection
h the idea of the

ad become interes-
out of Christ, be-
t the dead were "*in*
Nor did we begin
had preached and
ix Sermons" on the
rtal?" And when
us that we might
popular a doctrine
it filled us with a
aw that the Scrip-
*raise not the Lord*,"
*wledge*," with many
port, we bowed to
*positive* testimony,
y sustained by *in-*
r, were plausible,
was a new trial, to
ach, yet fully be-
called us to it, we
his cross also; and
we regretted having
ne to go back from
of the literal death

that awaits the wicked: yea, some who were disposed to favor us, while we stopped at our first position, became our most bitter persecutors.

Bro. White misapprehends us if he supposes that we make "*the unconsciousness of the soul after death* AN ESSENTIAL *article of faith among*" *us*. We are truly sorry if anything has appeared in the Examiner that can be construed to such a conclusion. We disavow any such *intention*, so far as we are concerned; while at the same time we most sincerely believe that if there is no resurrection, there is *no future life*. Others may differ from us, on this point, without affecting our Christian fellowship for them, provided they cheerfully grant us the same right to differ with them: in other words, we are perfectly willing to leave it "*an open question*," on which all shall be at full liberty to hold and express their conviction of what is truth without being suspected of a want of sincerity, honesty and christian candor. Here, if we understand Bro. White, he is willing to meet us; and he will forgive us if we again express the conviction that he will yet see the state of the dead to be that of unconscious sleep; but we cannot blame him for desiring that we may see the subject in the same light he does; and, if we know our own heart, we have no hostility to a conversion to his view only that which arises from our conception of what the Scriptures teach on the subject; yet he may be right and we wrong. We have found ourself wrong sometimes, and may yet do so again; still, on this point it seems to us we must have very near the truth, if not exactly. We hope he will write us articles for the Examiner, and feel himself at perfect liberty to take his own course in relation to the matter he will furnish. In our extracts from his work, we have used our judgment in selecting such portions as we thought would most interest our readers.

We commenced a notice of the republished work by Bro. Moncrieff, but have been led into the strain of remarks preceding by the circumstance of his communication so soon following Br. White's letter, and the unexpected tidings, which now, for the first time, reach us, of Br. Moncrieff's conviction that the dead are truly unconscious. Hereafter we shall give some or all his "notes" in the Examiner.

The work is for sale by Ward & Co., 27 Paternoster Row, London; James Keep, 32 Nicolson st., Edinburg; and James Smith, 32 Nelson street, Glasgow; and we presume by Moncrieff, Musselburg, Scotland. Price 6d. Bro. Moncrieff's reply to Rev. J. Kirk's pamphlet, entitled "The Warning, or the Future Punishment of the Impenitent considered," we presume is for sale at the places above named. That work we hope will be widely circulated. Price eight pence.

———o———

THE NEW POSTAGE LAW went into effect the first day of this month, and we wish to give our readers all the information we can as to its operation on the Examiner and our other publications. There are some things not very clear in its bearings; but we will give the best light we have.

The Bible Examiner is now subject to the following rates of postage:

1. Any distance under 50 miles, *one cent and a quarter* for *three months*, i. e., for three numbers; to be paid by the subscriber *in advance*.

2. Any distance over 50 miles and under 300, *two cents and a half* for three months.

3. Over 300 miles and under 1000, *three cents and three quarters* for three months.

4. Over 1000 miles and under 2000, *five cents* for three months.

5. Over 2000 and under 4000 miles, six cents and one quarter for three months.

6. Over 4000 miles, *seven cents and one half*.

The postage is the same on the "Christian Truth-Seeker," issued from our office.

The most vexatious part of the new law is that which relates to *books* and *pamphlets*, requiring the *pre-payment* of the postage on them in all cases, if we understand the Postmaster General's instructions. Under the head of "Rates of Postage to be charged upon all transient Newspapers and *every other description of printed matter*, except Newspapers and Periodicals published at intervals not exceeding three months, and sent from the office of publication actual to and bona fide subscribers," after stating the rates it is added—

"1. On every transient newspaper, unsealed circular, handbill, periodical, magazine, *book, and every description of printed matter*, the above rates must, *in all cases, be pre-paid*, according to the weight."

"2. Whenever any printed matter on which the postage is required to be pre-paid, shall, through the inattention of the Postmaster, or otherwise, be sent *without* pre-payment, the same shall be charged with *double* the above rates."

Surely all this is imposing enough to make *we* publishers of books, &c., take care how we use the mail to send them abroad. We are therefore compelled to say, that we can send neither books nor pamphlets to any one by mail except the person ordering them remit us, in *addition* to the price of the work, the full amount of the postage on the work to its destination. This can be done by purchasing Post Office stamps at their own Post Office, and remitting them to us in the letter containing the order for the works desired. To enable our friends to do so, we give them a list of our books and pamphlets; with the amount of postage to be *pre-paid* on each, on the last page of the Examiner. The rates of postage there set down after the notice of each work is as near accurate as we are able to give this month. If we find ourself in error on any of them we shall correct hereafter.

The rates of postage on letters weighing half an ounce and under, if *pre-paid*, for any distance not over 3000 miles, is *three* cents: If not *pre-paid*, *five* cents. Any distance over 3000 miles, *six* cents. To and from Canada, for any distance not exceeding 3000 miles, *ten* cents; over 3000, *fifteen* cents. On each additional half ounce another rate is charged, or double, and so on, in all cases.

On our *papers* sent to Canada, we have to *pre-pay* the postage, which is now 15 cents per year, instead of 18, as under the old law. On *letters* to and from Canada, under the new law, it is *optional* with the sender to *pre-pay* the postage or not.

Letters to and from Great Britain and Ireland, 24 cents for each half ounce or under. Pre-payment optional. We have no space to give the rates for other countries, but they remain the same, we believe, as under the old law.

———o———

THE CHRISTIAN TRUTH-SEEKER AND MISCELLANY. —We have issued three numbers of that paper. Hereafter, no advertisement, unless it be a short notice, will appear in it. It now contains a larger amount of matter, for the price, than most other papers; and is executed in a style that will compare with any other. It is true that we have filled a considerable portion of the columns with *selected* matter; but we think it is none the less valuable on that account. Much of it is matter to which our readers could not have access from other sources, or without labor and expense not at their command. Besides, we often find that the selected matter gives quite as much satisfaction as the original articles, and we have occasionally noticed that papers which have been strong in favor of *original* articles have copied our *selected* matter. There is often most interesting matter in foreign or scarce works, which our readers are not likely to see, unless some one is at the expense and labor to bring it out; and he may have to travel through much rubbish to cull out valuable and interesting items. This work it is the business of an editor to perform, as well as write editorial, and edit the articles of his correspondents, which is sometimes no small task, truly.

———o———

SIGNS OF ANTICHRIST.—In our last, we gave an extract from a volume of tracts published in England in 1847. In this we give another, relating to the dangerous characters of the *Literature and Education* of the present times. These topics have been the subject of many painful apprehensions to us for several years past; and we commend the following remarks to the candid and solemn consideration of all; especially to parents and youth. "The *Antichrist*" will ere long be developed, we are confident. Who shall escape his horrid power? Surely those will not who *sleep* in the notion that there is *no danger!* or, under the cry, now becoming so universal, of "peace and safety." The author of the tract says:—

"The most fearful and ominous sign of the approach of Antichrist, is to be seen in the *Protestant Literature* of the day. Here even Popery itself seems to be outdone. The world is deluged with novels and periodicals, from the hands of professing Protestants, many of whom make it their avowed object to advance the welfare of mankind, and all of whom boast of the progress of civilization. Yet when we examine these writers more accurately, we shall find them preparing the public mind for the reception of all the subtleties of Antichrist. The Tractarians are circulating their feeble but showy volumes, written purposely to attract and captivate the young and the romantic; casting some of the gorgeous light of the Roman Church over the ceremonies and institutions of Protestantism; throwing all spiritual things into the back-ground of their picture, and bringing forward the priest, the baptismal font, and the decorated altar, as the central group; throwing upon them all their light—giving them their warmest coloring—and fixing the eyes of the rising generation upon external rites and trivial ordinances, for the purpose of withdrawing them from spiritual objects. This has always been one of the artifices of an Antichristian Church; and if we look to *general* literature, we shall find it calling forth all the passions and energies of the Antichristian confederacy. One class of writers have taken up the horrible and ghastly school of the French romance, as their favorite model. Such men as Ainsworth and Bulwer, with a great deal of popular cleverness, but no real genius, have borrowed the manner of Parisian authors, and, like all other imitators, they have done still worse than the original inventors. A frightful medley of felons, assassins, profligates, and madmen, crowd their pages—their scenes and characters are worked up to an intensity of force, as if human life were a perpetual fever, and atrocity the only occupation of great men. This *felon* literature—this heroism of the gallows, seems the grand object of all their exhibitions; carried out by means of situations in which no man was ever placed—sufferings such as were never endured—and villanies which in real life occupied an age, raked together in the fictitious history of an hour. Such vile literature as this must harden and brutalize every reader. It makes atrocity become a necessary excitement, and thut prepares the hearts of thousands for welcoming whatever horror or confusion may be poured forth upon the world.

Another class of writers have adopted the school of burlesque and ridicule. With *them*, everything human, and some things divine, are the groundwork of some jest, or some sportive sarcasm; nothing can occur amongst men, not even war and famine, but it gives rise to some humorous scene, or is made the subject of some lively caricature. The effect of this is equally pernicious, though in an opposite way—

for, as the atrocious school" hardens the heart to deeds of blood, so the "school of burlesque" hardens it into universal indifference. Each is equally a sign of the debasement of literature. It proves that we have drained off the old racy wine of the intellect, and are now compelled to revel upon the dregs. And each of them is equally a cause as well as a sign of approaching evil. For let the great Antichristian confederacy be once formed with an Antichrist at its head—let the world be once broken up by revolution and confusion, and where shall we find the multitudes who now take delight in these publications? Can we doubt where? The disciples of the "atrocious school" will join the movement with delight, for they will then hope to see actually, in real life, those terrible deeds, and those tempestuous characters, which they have so long read of, and admired, in the pages of romance. The disciples of the "school of burlesque" will join the same movement as a laughable diversion, as offering an exercise for their wit. Or they will stand carelessly aside to satirize all parties, and allow themselves to be crushed into perdition, while they think that all is but a jest! The Protestant, as well as the Popish world, is filled with multitudes of such persons—they are increasing as our literature is spread abroad: and every one of such is a fit proselyte ready made for Antichrist.

"The last subject at present is that of general Protestant *Education*. It may be thought that the universal rage for education at the present day, especially in Protestant countries, must, by degrees, convert the world, But if so, we fully believe that it will only convert and prepare the world for the reign of Antichrist. The character of Antichrist is not that of a madman like Alexander, or a tyrant like Nero, but it is that of a *Substitute for God*. The very essence of the Antichristian confederacy is the substitution of human wisdom and human virtue, in place of divine, as the means of producing the greatest happiness and of renovating the world. It is the general movement of the world, in a state of *self-adoration* and *self-dependence*, towards imaginary and impossible perfection. It is *this* which will give birth to the Antichristian confederacy; and it is this very movement which, at the present day, forms the pride and glory of all our liberal publications. And can our system of Protestant education counteract and defeat this movement? On the contrary, it will hasten it onward! The whole object of our general education is power and worldly prosperity. Every branch of art and science—every faculty of the human mind—all the progress of society is trained in the one direction—to increase the power of man in the outward material world—to acquire wealth—to promote commercial enterprize—to perfect the refinements of luxury—to ward off the pains and hardships of life, and to make the earth a sensual material paradise to some, and a theatre of scientific vanity and display to others. The most admired and envied man is he who, by some clever scheme, or some happy invention, can acquire a name in the scientific world, or secure the largest amount of wealth. And the young are educated, and the old are hardened into one monotonous sensation (for *passion* is too honorable a word,) and that sensation is —material prosperity, and the deification of the human intellect. Can such education restore the world to God? And our *religious* education is not to be trusted. Enter a parochial school, and what do you find? Catechisms learned by rote—texts of Scripture repeated as a task—mechanical exactness—spiritual neglect—quickness and good memory rewarded and admired—military regularity enforced, as if our spiritual enemies were an army of soldiers, to be conquered by superior tactics, and by military discipline! But the education of the heart utterly forgotten—the mighty tide of the passions left to roll on beneath, until the foundations of society are undermined, while the surface looks secure and stable. The education of the heart (we repeat) is unknown! and children are converted into machines, which are either dull or elastic, according to their *metal*, but nine-tenths of which are unconscious of spiritual life. Some, indeed, will be converted, * * * but the great majority are only hardened and made insolent by this mechanical education.

"We must now conclude: and as the substance of the last two numbers, we leave it to the consideration of every reader, whether the world can be regenerated and converted even by Protestantism itself, while the Protestant Church has been already corrupted and converted by the world. To us it appears evident, that the present movement of mankind is almost universally towards one point—the self-perfection of man, and the substitution of the human intellect for God. And this must quickly end in the dethronement of the Deity, and the establishment of Antichrist, until the Day of Vengeance shall have arrived."

———o———

FROM FREDERICK WRIGHT.

*Spencerville*, Canada West, 1851.

BR. STORRS:—Were it for no other reason than to obey the imperative commands of gratitude, I feel constrained to address you, but at this time of destitution of sound and perfect knowledge, and the great lack of oral instruction we experience, so far as pertains to our eternal welfare, I feel doubly incited to acknowledge the depth of my indebtedness to you for the monthly visits of the Examiner. The clear, and I may say, the practical view given in its columns, on various bible subjects, ought indeed to be highly prized and well studied by all who love the word of Truth and Life. I have the volumes for 1849 and 50, with half a dozen of the Six Sermons

in sheets, abroad, doing the good and sacred work of evangelists; and I trust not without effect, owing to the blessing of heaven. One instance out of many. A Presbyterian friend, with whom I have been in friendly controversy on the subject of the speedy advent of Christ, for the last year and more, and have found to be a "regular hard head," the most I could get him to acknowledge was, "it might be so," and "it was certain there was some *great* thing going to happen to the world;" what that "great thing" was I could never get him to say, only "it was not the coming of Christ." On the subject of "Life and Death," however, there has been more success. After reading the "Six Sermons," he requested a longer time; and on re-reading them, candidly and freely acknowledged his conviction of the truth of what was taught in them, and expressed his sorrow that he should so long have allowed himself to be led blindfold by others, while he had the word of God in his house. Give God the praise, brother. Truth is a mighty weapon to the pulling down of the strongholds of Satan; and I do believe his strongest, as it is his *oldest* fortress, to be man's belief in *inherent immortality*. Not that it is a strong castle in itself, but it has far extended outflanking bulwarks, that bar the approach of man to reach the truth as it is in Christ, and in *Him only*, almost in every direction. Oh! how I long for the time when it shall be razed to the foundation, and the ploughshare of God's immutable truth shall turn up its lowest stones, and lay bare to every eye the false and shifting sands on which it was built. As for me, my mind is made up. I have tried the height, the length, the breadth and depth of human philosophy, and I have proved it vain to satisfy the longings of the soul thereby.

> I'd rather have one shred of Bible Truth,
> Than ponderous tomes of man's scholastic lore.

One, "Thus saith the Lord," has more weight on my mind than the thousand volumes I have read; nay, more than the combined millions that have been published since printing first began. Mayst thou be guided unto all Truth, and have the heart bestowed upon thee, to give it broadcast to the world,

> Heedless of its scorn, and fearless of its hate.

The aim, the *end* of the true Christian's labor, in those days of deep and soul-enticing delusion, should not be so much to gain converts over to any sect, or particular class or code of opinions, as to open the eyes blinded by prejudice and education, and convert the individual from the damning power of error to the life-giving, soul-animating influence of truth. This spirit seems, indeed, to pervade the pages of the Examiner; and for this do I thank God from the depths of my heart. Apropos, to the object of inquiry. I would be glad to see the few remarks in the April number, on the subject of the Papal power not being that "wicked one," followed up. I have this some time back believed the world, and my Advent brethren too, need more light on this subject. An Advent brother, in whose judgment I have much confidence, to whom I wrote on the subject, expressing the surmise that he would perhaps doubt the sanity of my conclusions, not only writes to me in concurrence, but he also had been looking at the *same* subject, at the *same* time, through the *same* glass, (the Bible,) and had arrived at the *same* point. How strange that three individuals, wide apart, and holding no communication on the subject, should thus be engaged in the *same* study at the *same* time. I am very diffident of myself, not possessing near as much knowledge of the "Good Book" as of the "schools." I shall wait with patient anxiety, if you will allow me the phrase, to hear and learn something more on the important point. I say important, inasmuch as the revelation of that "wicked one" immediately precedes the coming of the King of Glory. The midnight darkness before the dawn! The depth of wickedness before the fulness of purity! The highest acme of impious daring before the revelation of the Lord of Lords and King of Kings! Mysticism and folly may do their most, but to the believer in the Bible—

> Thanks be to God! The way is plain!
> The crooked paths are straight!
> While proudly Faith's uplifted hand
> Points to Life's open Gate!
> Through Jesus Christ we enter in
> Unto the promised rest,
> And all our toils and griefs forget,
> While pillowed on his breast.

Trusting solely on the mercy of God and merits of Jesus, I hope we may be permitted to congratulate each other on an abundant entrance therein, and remain thy brother in the love of truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

———o———

FROM THOMAS J. HARRIS.

*Harrisburg*, June 11th, 1851.

BRO. STORRS:—The brethren here and myself are pleased with the Examiner, and generally agree with your expositions of scripture. I, however, sometimes disagree with you. In the last Examiner, you say that Paul is arguing in the 15th of 1 Cor. about the resurrection of the righteous exclusively, and says nothing of the wicked. I think he is contending for a resurrection without confining his argument to the righteous exclusively, for he does mention both righteous and wicked. In 22d v. he says, "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall *all* be made alive." If the "all" in the last part of the verse refers to the righteous only, then the "all" in the first part does also, and the righteous only die in Adam, while the wicked do not die at all in Adam, but are immortal. If all do not die in Adam, there was no necessity for Christ's tasting death for every man, and he says, John 5: 28, 29, "All shall hear his voice and come forth;" and Paul says, Acts 24:

15, there shall be a resurrection of the just and unjust; but, 1 Cor. 15: 23, every man in his own order; Christ the first fruits; afterward, they that are Christ's at his coming—and if Paul does not tell us 1 Cor. 15, when the wicked will be raised, John does, Rev. 20: 3–5, 1000 years, and a little season after the righteous. If all the human family are raised from death through Christ, it does not follow they will all have eternal life.

In the May number of the Examiner, some person (I have lost the paper) from England says that some of the daughters of the old mother quote Isa. 33: 14, to prove the wicked will have eternal life in misery. He says it does not refer to the punishment of the wicked at all. I think if he will examine and read from the 14th to the 17th verse, he will see it is as strong a text as we have in the scriptures to prove that the wicked will not have eternal life in misery, or cannot dwell with everlasting burnings. God says "Who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings?" The question is answered in the 15th and 16th verses, and it is the righteous that can do it. We have an example. When Nebuchadnezzar cast the three Hebrews into the fiery furnace, the fire devoured the wicked persons that threw them in, while the three Hebrews were not hurt, neither was the smell of fire upon them. Dan. 3: 27, &c. As Christ is coming in flaming fire, 2 Thess. 1: 8; Isa. 66: 15, 16, the fire may be all around us, but his people will not be hurt.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.—If Bro. Harris supposes our remarks on 1 Cor. 15, were intended to deny the resurrection of the wicked, he misapprehends us entirely. The *resurrection* is the main subject of that chapter, and especially the resurrection of Christ and those who "have fallen asleep in Christ." Certainly, the apostle is not basing any argument on the resurrection of the wicked, if he refers to it at all, which we do not think he does in *that chapter*. If Br. Harris thinks otherwise, he has the same right to his opinion we have to ours, and we have no fault to find with him for it.

———o———

"TRUE SOURCE OF IMMORTALITY, by *Thomas Read*, New York."—The articles which have been published in the Examiner within the last year and a half, under this caption, have been revised by the author, and much enlarged under the various topics, as well as many new points inserted, making double the amount of reading. We think of publishing the work in pamphlet, but cannot do it without aid, as we have no funds, nor has Bro. Read. It will make a pamphlet of from 100 to 150 pages, 12mo., according to the size of type used. We think of using the same as that with which the Examiner is now printed; in that case the first thousand copies will cost about $150, and we must have near that amount in cash before commencing. If any friend or friends will advance that sum, we will refund it from the first sales of the work, and proceed to get it out immediately. In the meantime, let us hear from all, who wish it published, to know how many copies you will take and pay for when it is ready for delivery. The price will not *exceed* 25 cents, retail; and the first edition, at wholesale, shall be put at the actual cost *only*.

———o———

THE "BAPTIST MINISTER," whose letter we published in March, omitting his name, now informs us that "the demand for light on *Destruction*, &c., increases fast." We expect him in this city in a few weeks, and hope he will come prepared to spend some time preaching here; as there are many Baptists, as well as others, who will be specially glad to see and hear him. We are sorry to learn he has been sick.

———o———

ROBERT HARPER.—We have not seen A. Campbell's articles on the "Spiritual Universe;" his paper never visits us; it is doubtless too *spiritual* to be seen by such *matter-of-fact* eyes as we possess; and from what you say, we judge the articles ars a mass of *heathen lore*.

———o———

"THE SEVERAL ADDRESSES of the Rochester Conference, the New York Convention. and the Hartford Conference, published by order of the Boston Conference." They are put up in a neat 12mo. pamphlet of 16 pages, with paper covers; and sold at the extreme low price of $1,50 per hundred copies. This pamphlet ought to have a wide circulation. While we may not adopt every sentiment found in it, we think as a whole it is called for at this time, and sets forth truly the grounds of christian fellowship and christian liberty.

Those who wish to scatter it, should address *Dr. David Crary*, Hartford, Conn., and send the cash with their order.

———o———

TO JOSEPH EATON.—The Hebrew and English Concordance, or "Englishman's Hebrew Concordance," costs about $20, imported. We are decidedly of the opinion that for an English scholar, "*The Bible Student's Concordance*, by Prof. Pick," is much more valuable, and can be obtained at one-half the price, We have examined both, and would rather have Pick's work at the same price. For a critical examination of the original, to one acquainted with the Hebrew, the first named work would be valuable. We can get either work imported, if the cash is sent us.

———o———

"TRUE SOURCE OF LIFE, by *George Storrs*."—A new Tract. See last page of the *Examiner for this month*. If it is judged useful by the friends, let them scatter it.

## BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, TRACTS, &c.

☞ We design to keep constantly on hand the following Works on the grand gospel truth of "*Immortality for Man only in Christ,*" and let a new effort be made to place them in every house in the land.

1. "*Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment,* by H. H. Dobney," Baptist Minister; an argument in two parts. This is a reprint of an English work of great power, showing the righteous only will live forever, and that the punishment of the wicked is *destruction—death.* It contains 286 pages, 12mo. Price reduced to 50 cents, bound; 37½ cents in paper covers.

Postage, on bound volume, under 500 miles, 14 cents; over 500 and under 1500, 28 cents; over 1500 and under 2500, 42 cents. In *paper covers,* under 500 miles, 9 cents; over 500 and under 1500, 18 cents; over 1500 and under 2500, 27 cents, over 2500 and under 3500, 36 cents.

2. "*Dobney Abridged.*"—We have published the Second Part of the Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment, in an edition by itself. Our object has been to furnish all that is really essential in the controversy, to enable the reader to decide whether *endless torture,* or *destruction of being,* is the true teaching of Scripture in relation to the end of the wicked; and to to furnish it so *cheap* as to place it within the reach of all. The abridged work we put at the extremely low price of 25 cents single copy, of about 220 pages, 12mo.

Postage, under 500 miles, 6 cents; over 500 and under 1500, 12 cents; over 1500 and under 2500, 18 cents; over 2500 and under 3500, 24 cts.

3. "*Dialogues on Future Punishment,* by Rev. W. Glen Moncrieff," Scotland. A most valuable and convincing work, which ought to be in the hands of every person where the gospel is preached. It is a familiar examination of the question of *Immortality* conducted in a spirit that cannot fail to interest. It is a pamphlet of 60 pages, 12mo. Price 15 cts.

Postage, under 500 miles, 3 cents; over 500 and under 1500, 6 cents; over 1500 and under 2500, 9 cts; over 2500 and under 3500, 12 cts.

4. "*The Unity of Man, or Life and Death Realities.* A Reply to Rev. Luther Lee, by Anthropos." This is a thorough refutation of Mr. Lee's position of the natural *immortality* of man. It contains 122 pages, 18mo., in paper covers. Price 15 cents.

Postage same as on "Dialogues," by Moncrieff.

5. "*Six Sermons,* by Geo. Storrs. An inquiry, *Are the Wicked Immortal?*" To which is added a dissertation on the "State of the Dead," and prefixed Archbishop Whately's remarks on "The Second Death." It has 128 pages, 12mo. Price 15 cents in paper covers.

Postage supposed to be the same as on "Dialogues," by Moncrieff, but may possibly be two cents higher.

6. "*Can you Believe?* by W. Glen Moncrieff," Scotland. A tract of four pages. It is well calculated to arrest attention and lead men to see the absurdity of the notion of *immortality* in sin and suffering. Price 30 cents per hundred.

7. "*Second Death,* by Archbishop Whately;" to which is added "*Opinions of Eminent Men,*" &c.; a a tract of eight pages. It is of great value, and may be placed in the hands of persons who, perhaps, would read nothing else on the *immortality question.* Price 60 cents per hundred.

8. "*The Rich Man and Lazarus.*" A tracts of 12 pages, the same as published in connection with the *Six Sermons.* 18mo. Price 75 cents per hundred.

9. "*The Two Thrones, or The Throne of God and the Throne of Christ.*" This tract goes to show the present position of Christ, and what it will be in the age to come. He is now on the throne of God in heaven; he will be, in the future age, on the "throne of David in Jerusalem," reigning, with his saints made immortal, over all the earth. Text, Rev. iii. 21. It has 20 pages, 12mo. Price 2 cents.

10. "*True Source of Life,* by Geo. Storrs." A new tract of 12 pages, 18mo. Same matter that appeared in the Examiner for June. Price $1 per hundred.

Tracts should not be ordered by mail unless near an ounce be sent for; as any fractional part of an ounce will be charged as if a full one; and the postage is 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 cents per ounce, according to the distances already named. We judge it will take about 40 pages to make one ounce.

11. "*Storrs' Miscellany.*" This contains the foregoing Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9, bound in one volume. Price 42 cents.

Postage, under 500 miles, 9 cents; over 500 and under 1500, 18 cents; over 1500 and under 2500, 27 cents, &c.

12. "*The Immateriality of the Soul,* or Man entirely dependent upon his organization for all his mental and moral powers. By Thomas Read, New York." This work shows that the notion of the *immateriality* of the soul is contrary both to philosophy and scripture, and is sustained by neither. It is a neat pamphlet of 24 pages, 12mo., with covers. Price 7 cents.

Postage 1, 2, 3, 4. or 5 cents, according to distance, weighing only one ounce.

13. "*Our Israelitish Origin,* or Lectures on Ancient Israel, by J. Wilson," England. This work is designed to show that the modern inhabitants of Europe, and the people of the United States, are the literal descendants of Jacob, and of the lost tribes of Israel. Price 75 cents bound, or 50 cents in paper covers.

Postage the same as on "Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment." See No. 1.

14. "*Christian Psalmody, or Psalms and Hymns* for the use of all Christians." The price, in paper covers, 12½ cents, or 12 copies for one dollar; bound in plain morocco 20 cents, with one-third off to those who buy to sell again; in plain gilt gilt, 25 cents, 5 copies for $1; gilt extra, 37½ cents, or three copies for $1.

Postage, bound, same as "Dialogues" by Moncrieff. See No. 3. In paper covers, 2, 4, 6, or 8 cents, according to the distance.

On all the foregoing works, except the last, 1-third discount will be allowed to those who buy to sell again; but in all cases the purchaser *must* add to the price *the amount of postage,* if ordered sent by Mail.

15. "*Bible Examiner,* Extra." This contains Archbishop Whately's remark on the 'Second Death,' a history of the Doctrine of an *Immortal Soul*—our "*Six Sermons*" on the inquiry—*Are the Wicked Immortal?* With some other matters. The Extra is 16 pages quarto, and sold at the extremely low price of $2 per hundred. It contains more matter for the price than any other work we have, and the price does but barely pay the cost of printing. No discount allowed on this work.

Postage, 2, 4, 6, 8, or 10 cents, according to distance. The postage on this work is greatly increased by the new law.

☞ *All orders, remittances, &c., must be addressed*

GEORGE STORRS,
Philadelphia, Pa.

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VI. PHILADELPHIA, AUGUST, 1851. NO. 8.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,

At 68 North Eighth Street, between Arch and Cherry,

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, $1; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; always in advance.

## STATE OF THE DEAD.

BY REV. WM. GLEN MONCRIEFF, SCOTLAND.

This brother has republished, in England and Scotland, Henry Grew's pamphlet on "*The Intermediate State,*" or state of the dead prior to the resurrection, to which he has appended "notes" and added an "appendix," all of much interest. We present our readers with the principal notes, to be followed by the appendix. The first note is a prefatory one, as follows:—

"The question as to the state of the dead has long occupied my own thoughts, and has frequently been proposed to me by others, and the following short treatise is issued because it seems to be fitted to help God's people to arrive at a scriptural understanding of the matter. Let it be used as a human *help* to the comprehension of a deeply interesting subject, and the wish of the pious author, and of the editor, will be gained.

"The editor wishes it to be understood that he does not endorse all that is said in the author's pages, the treatise on the general question is the best, among the smaller works he has seen on the subject, and he considers it worthy of a careful perusal. Here and there a very few sentences have been omitted in the text to save space, but they were not essential to the argument. A few notes have been added to the text, and these are signed with the editor's initials. The reader's attention is also requested to the "Appendix" at the close of the work.

"Musselburgh, April, 1851."

After the text Gen. 2: 7, quoted by Bro. Grew, Bro. Moncrieff appends the following note:

"If man, after receiving the breath of life, became "a living soul," he must have been a soul before he became alive, just as a watch is a watch before it is wound up and made to go;—wind it up and it is a going watch. That which God made of "dust" (Gen. 2: 7, "God formed man of the dust of the ground,") was SOUL, and all that it needed to make it a LIVING soul, was the breath of life. God "breathed" not soul into man, but "the breath of life," and man,—the soul man, the organized being made of dust, became, on receiving the life-breath, a living soul. Such is the account of the soul man, delivered by Him who made man at first. In being a soul, man does not differ from the other animals in the world, for they *are souls* as much as he is; the difference between them consists in the position in the scale of creation which he has above the other living souls formed by the Creator. That the inferior creatures are souls as well as man can be easily shown. Here is the proof: Gen. 1: 21, "God created great whales and every living creature (Hebrew, "living soul,") that moveth." Verse 24, "Let the earth bring forth the living creature," (Hebrew, "living soul.") The same Hebrew word (*nephesh*) translated creature in these texts, is the identical term used in the original translated "soul" in the expression "man became a living *soul*," Gen. 2: 7. If man was a soul before he got the breath of life, it only made him a soul alive; and, hence, we see at once that when he loses his breath, ceases to breathe, and, therefore, to live, he must be a *dead soul.* Hence we read, Num. 9: 6, "defiled by the dead body of a man"—Hebrew, the dead soul (*nephesh*) of a man: the "dead soul" of a man is then just a dead man. Num. 6: 6, "He shall come at no dead body," (*nephesh*, Hebrew dead soul.) See Cruden under the word "soul." In harmony with this we find, souls smitten with the sword, Josh. 10: 30, 32, 39, and 11: 11;—a soul redeemed from the grave, Ps. 30, 3, and 49: 15;—a soul delivered from death, or, a man spared in the land of the living, Ps. 56: 13;—we read also of a soul going to the grave, Ps. 89: 48;—of the blood of souls, Jer. 2: 34;—and of souls dying, "the soul that sinneth it shall die," Ezek. 18: 4.

"It is justice to the English reader to inform him, that the word translated "life," in the phrase "breath of life," is in the Hebrew plural, "breath of lives" (*ruach chayim.*) But in this there is no peculiarity in man, for the inferior creatures, the other souls made by God, received also "the breath of lives." For instance, Gen. 6: 17, "Behold I, even I, do bring a flood of waters upon the earth to destroy all flesh, wherein is the breath of life," (Heb. "lives," *ruach chayim.*") Gen. 7: 15, "And they went in unto Noah into the ark, two and two of all flesh, wherein is the breath of life, (Heb. "lives," *ruach chayim.*) Solomon says men and animals have all one breath, (*ruach.*) Eccles. 3: 19. It appears to me that men, fishes, and other living animal creatures, are said to have the breath "of lives," because they have a portion of that breath which sustains so many different lives on this globe. They have all one breath, (*ruach;*) but it is the breath that quickens and supports the lives of many and very diversified living souls."

After the texts Gen. 35: 18; 1 Kings 17: 21, 22, and Psa. 16: 10, he inserts the following:—

"Even these three texts have no reference to what is *popularly* called a soul; a few words will show this. Gen. 35: 18, "And it came to pass, as her soul was in departing, (for she died.)" Soul here designates *life,* and life is called "soul" inasmuch as it was the life of her—a soul. 1 Kings 17: 21, 22, "Let this child's soul come into him again," i. e. let his life (called soul because it animated the soul) come into him again, or let him live again by beginning again to breathe; see verse 17. Ps. 16: 10, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption." The word "hell" here (Heb. sheol) signifies the state of

the dead, sometimes translated grave in the Old Testament, as in Eccles. 9: 10, "There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave, (*Bisheol*, i. e, *bi*, in—*sheol*, the state of the dead,) whither thou goest." To be in *sheol* is to be in the state of the dead, where the dead lie. "My soul" in the first part of the verse is paralleled and explained by thy "holy one" in the second; so that the verse may be read thus,—Thou wilt not leave my soul, or thy holy one in the state of the dead; neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one, or my soul, in a word, *me* to see corruption. Christ's soul then was that which could see corruption, or become corrupt, but which God here promises should not see corruption. The verse then is simply a promise that, though Christ should die, he would have a *very early resurrection*, a resurrection before corruption commenced. Compare John 2: 18, 19, 21; John 11: 39; Acts 2: 22, on to the end of verse 34.

On the text Matt. 22: 31, 32, we have this note:

"Luke says our Lord concluded his argument thus, 'He is not the God of the dead, but of the living; for all live unto him," 20. 38. Well then, let it be observed that the subject in dispute was the resurrection, which the Sadduces utterly denied. Our Lord affirmed there was a resurrection and proved it by the quotation from the Old Testament, concerning God being the God of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob. Let us take the common idea, that man has a spirit which lives and thinks when separated from the body, and then ask what proof would the existence of such a spirit, after death, be of a resurrection? We can see no force in it. The Sadduces might have replied, suppose we grant the spirits of Abraham and Isaac are now living in a disembodied state, that is no evidence of the resurrection of their bodies, for, if their spirits are living though disembodied, they may so continue to live on forever. And yet our Lord's argument was so successful that its power astonished the multitude who heard the debate. Matt. 22: 33. If the living of these men depended on a future resurrection, the argument was clearly unanswerable, and it seems to be so, only on that supposition. "God is not the God of the dead,"—of utterly and perpetually defunct beings. But how, it may be asked, can it be true of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that they "all live unto God?" Two explanations may be submitted for the reader's consideration. 1st. As the Saviour does not say they now live with God, but that they live "unto him," it may mean, they are living with respect to him, or he views them as living when he says he is still their God. Or, 2d. They may be said all to "live unto him" to imitate the certainty that they will yet awake to live forever, just as we find the Bible calling that dead which is not actually dead, but doomed to die, and certainly to die, as in these texts, 'So death passed upon all men.' Rom. 5: 12, 15. 'If Christ be in you, the body is dead.' Rom. 8: 10. 'Ye are dead, but your life is hid with Christ in God.' Col. 3: 4."

On 1 Thess. 4: 13–17, he appends these remarks:

"It should be remarked that, in the passage referred to, death is called a 'sleep,' as in other places. Do men think when they are sound asleep? Again, it is said the saints living at Christ's coming will not 'prevent' or go before the resurrected holy ones, to meet the Lord and enjoy his glory. 1 Thess. 4: 13, 17. If the spirits of these dead saints are now with Jesus, seeing him face to face, have they not gone before those living on earth? and yet the apostle says the living, when Jesus comes, will not go before them? The passage teaches that all are to meet him *at once;* so it seems a fair question—how can dead saints be seeing him now?"

In his note on the case of the rich man and Lazarus, he remarks:—

"Whitby, the Commentator, says, regarding this part of our Lord's teaching, (Luke 16: 20–31,) it 'is only a parable, and not a real history of what was actually done, because we find this very parable in the *Gemara Babylonicum*, whence it is cited by Mr. Sheringham, in his preface to his *Joma*.' Moreover, it should be considered that our Lord represents the rich man as in Hades, not in Gehanna, the fire-hell. Sheol is the state of the dead, as formerly mentioned, and Hades, the Greek synomym for Sheol, imports the same thing. The prophecy in Ps. 16: 10, 'Thou wilt not leave my soul (or me) in Sheol,' is, by the inspired Peter, expressed thus, 'Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell,' (Hadou,) i. e. in the condition of the dead, exposed to corruption, which would have taken place had Jesus not been quickly raised. In Sheol, or Hades, 'there is neither work nor device,' &c. Eccles. 9: 10. If Hades, or Sheol, is such a state, how could the rich man there be actually suffering, and speaking? Does it not meet all the demands of the narrative, which is surely a parable, or fictitious story, employed by our Lord to teach some great general truth—we say, does it not answer all the demands of the parable, to understand Lazarus as representing the poor despised Gentiles: about to be taken into favor with God, as it were, lifted to Abraham's bosom; and the rich man to tipify the Jews, long rich in privileges, but mighty abusers of them, about to be judicially cut off, (Rom. 11,) and subjected to trials so severe, that they were fitly to be represented by a man suffering in Hades, *had that been possible*, as some then appear to have imagined?"

His note on 2 Corth. 5: 1–10, is as follows:—

"This passage will perhaps be even a little plainer, if it is recollected that, according to Gen. 2: 7, a living body and a living soul are the same thing; and of course, that a living body is a living man, and so is a living soul. It is the property and privilege of a living soul to think, reason, and to own itself; so that the expression 'our earthy house' is just ourselves as we are, that is, ourselves mortal and corruptible. The 'our' is not the language of a being dwelling in an earthly house, but the language of a mortal man speaking of himself. The following seems to be a fair representation of the apostle's ideas: Verse 1, 'For we know that if we mortal believers were to die we shall be raised immortal. 2. For, as we are, we groan, earnestly desiring to be now immortalized and thereby freed from our pains. 3. Since being so immortalized we shall not be found naked, or in a state of death. 4. For we, as we are, groan, being burdened with cares, and, though anxious to be freed from them, we have no love for death, having a strong desire to be immortalized now, as the living saints will be when the Lord comes; we wish that mortality might be swallowed up of life, as would be the case if we mortal men were to be now immortalized. 5. Now he that hath wrought us for this immortality, which we expect at the resurrection, is God, who hath given us, in the meantime, the earnest of the Spirit; and, at the last day, we expect to receive the full promise; we shall then be spiritualized, (1 Cor. 15: 45, 48, 50,) by being perfectly born of the Spirit. 6. Therefore we are always bold in serving Christ, knowing that whilst we are mortal, we are absent from the

Lord, though not always to be so. 7. For we walk by faith, not by sight. 8. We are thus bold I say, even as we are, but, nevertheless, wishing rather to be immortalized and thereby to be with Jesus. 9. Wherefore we labor, that, whether present with him or absent from him, we may be accepted by him."

After Bro. Grew's remarks on Phil. 1: 23, the following note is appended:—

"One word more on this passage—Phil. 1: 23. It is questionable if Paul, when he said *'for me to die is gain,'* meant gain to himself or to Jesus. He does not say which. If it was gain to himself, then he intimated that, by dying, he would cease from his troubles and earn a great reward at the resurrection of the just. If it was gain to Christ, then it was the gain that would flow to Christ's gospel from his perseverance unto death, and his martyrdom. In either way the expression 'to die is gain' can get an excellent meaning, and a scriptural one, too, though the first is, perhaps, the most natural interpretation. The succeeding verses may be paraphrased thus:—'For if I live in the flesh, or continue alive as I am, this is the fruit of my labor: Christ shall be magnified, as I have already said, (v. 20,) and what I shall choose in my toil-worn and persecuted condition, I do not well know, for I am in a strait betwixt the two, that is, between living and dying, since I am not anxious for either of them, and yet one of them I must choose; I am not anxious for either of them, for I have a wish in my mind, if I only could get it granted, and it is this, to be immortalized and to be with Jesus; this is far better than living in these toils and sufferings—it is also far better than to die, for, in that case, I will not behold Jesus till the resurrection morning. However, it would not be profitable for you were I to die, or were my wish for immortalization to be graciously conceded to me by my Master, so then I will remain with you a while longer as I have done.' Paul does not assert a wish to depart *by death* to be with Christ. He desired, obviously, to depart in a way similar to Enoch and Elijah, by being immortalized at once, or, as he expresses the same idea in 2 Cor. 5: 4, by having 'mortality swallowed up of life,' as will be the case with the living saints when the Lord descends from heaven."

On the case of the "penitent thief," Luke 23: 43, is this note:—

"It will be observed that the thief asked something *future*, not something which he believed could be got by him on the day when he presented his petition to our Lord. He said, 'Lord, remembered me when thou *comest into* thy kingdom,' and thereby expressed his belief that the Saviour had a kingdom to come to, not a kingdom to go to. He will come to his kingdom when he sits down on his *own* throne, which is the throne of David; at present he sits on his Father's throne in heaven, till the predicted time for entering his kingdom and sitting down on his own throne has arrived. Now the thief asked to be remembered then, and our Lord gave him a promise that he would be with him in paradise, or in the paradisaical state, when the earth shall be a new earth, and the heavens a new heavens. Let us recollect the awful position of the dying thief, and how much he needed in his agony a word of consolation and hope. Such the Redeemer could not deny him. He would not leave him in suspense. He, therefore, answered his request at once—on the day when it was presented, and thereby did more than even the suppliant expected,—'I say unto thee to-day, (or I today say unto thee) thou shalt be with me in paradise.' This appears to be the simple meaning of our Lord, and it quite harmonizes with all the other scriptural teaching."

In our next we shall give extracts from his "*Additional Remarks*," which follow his notes.

## LIFE IN CHRIST.

BY EDWARD WHITE, ENGLAND.

[Continued from page 99.]

Br. White next proceeds to consider the "*grounds and reasons for* REGENERATION, or the new birth." After having shown that "*the loss of the Divine image in the character*"—or "*the moral corruption of our nature*"—is "one principal reason why we must be born again," he proceeds to say:—

It seems to be taught with equal clearness in the divine revelation, though but little remarked in modern times, that our *mortality*, or loss of the prospect of immortality, through the fall, is another principal ground for the necessity of the new birth. Being born under the curse of the law, DEATH for sin, we "must be born again," in order to inherit the everlasting kingdom of God.

A striking confirmation of this statement (as has been already noticed,) is afforded by the remarkable name imposed upon us by the Spirit of Inspiration, THE DEAD:—signifying those who are under sentence of death; as when God said to Abimelech, "*Thou art but a dead man.*" Gen. xx. 7. In every passage where this appellation is employed, it is indeed usually understood to convey nothing more than the idea of a state of *moral* alienation from God; without any reference to the prospect of existence or non-existence, of life or destruction. It is sometimes attempted to be explained by the unscriptural* phrase, "*dead to God,*" which is intended to

*The words LIFE and DEATH, with their derivatives, appear to be employed in Scripture to denote the following ideas:—

LIFE stands for the idea of

1. *Vital Existence*, as distinct from the death or dissolution of vegetable or animal structures; and as opposed to the insensibility of material things. Also, it signifies ETERNAL LIFE.

2. *Activity of movement or agency;* as, "living waters;" "the word of God is *quick* (living) and powerful;" "*quicken* thou me in thy way."

3. *Happy existence:* not *happiness* alone, but happy *life*. "In thy favor is Life." "Wisdom is a tree of Life." "Now I live if ye stand fast in the Lord."

4. "*Te be alive in the spirit*" is to be living a spiritual life in opposition to that carnal one of which Paul says, "If ye *live* after the flesh, ye shall die." So also, we find "alive unto God." Rom. vi. 11, and, "the life of God," or godly life." Eph. iv. 18.

But LIFE *never* seems to stand for *holiness* alone, or a state of union with God, as is commonly supposed. This appears to be a *purely gratuitous assertion;* on which rests the whole fabric of the opinions which we are venturing to reject. At the same time, it is readily granted that the term *Life* is properly *associated* in the case of the righteous with the idea of *holiness*, as it is also with the idea of *happiness*. *But, that it ever loses its proper radical meaning of existence has yet to be proved, and of course the burden of proof lies with the opposite party.*

DEATH, on the other hand, stands for—

1. *The loss or destruction of vegetable or animal life.* "A dead tree," "a dead lion," "a dead body."

2. The state of *condemnation to such literal death.* "Thou art but a dead man." Gen. xx. 7.

3. *Danger of Death.* "Thanks be to God who hath delivered

signify a departure from the "*life of God*," or a godly life, an absence of spiritual religion; so that the state of moral corruption above described is understood to be the only thing denoted whenever mankind is spoken of as "*dead in trespasses and sins.*" Now, although it is undeniable that whenever the race of man is represented as "*dead*," there is a strong collateral reference to their sinfulness, misery, and alienation from the blessed God, it seems both natural and necessary to conclude, from an examination of the evidence, that this term is employed with a special allusion to the originally denounced punishment of sin, the curse of the law,—to that death which, as we have already seen, Adam incurred, a total and final cessation of the being of the humanity. Let the passages in which the word occurs be adduced in their order:—

Matt. viii. 22: "Let *The Dead* bury their dead." Here the corpses (*nekrous*) which "the dead" were to bury, point strongly to a literal interpretation: i. e. "Let those without the spirit of life bury the defunct. Let those who are as good as corpses bury corpses;" (*neckroi, nekrous.*) If *The Dead* signified here only those who are devoid of religion, the parallel went no further than a play upon the words: but, interpreted in the sense suggested, the language of the Saviour appears instinct with deep and awful significance.

Eph. ii. 1–5: "And you hath he quickened (to you hath he given life) who were *dead* in trespasses and sins" (*nekrous*, corpses.) "But God who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he hath loved us, even when we were dead in sins, (*nekrous,*) hath quickened us (given us life,) together with Christ, *and raised us up*, and made us sit together in heavenly places."

Here, the *death* from which the Ephesians were delivered was one from which they were delivered when Christ was raised from the tomb, and one from which they were delivered "together with him." But this could not be a "moral death" of wickedness, since "in him was no sin." It could be only literal death, the opposite to which was "life in the ages to come" after a "resurrection." This life, the Ephesians could participate by union with Christ as their head, in the gift of immortality.

2 Cor. v. 14:—"If one died (*apethanen*) for all, *then were all dead*, (*ara oi pantes apethanon*) and that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again." Here, the word *dead* must signify *the same thing* in the two clauses, "*if one died for all*," and, "*then were all dead;*" else, the adverb *then* is a mockery of the forms of reasoning. But the *death* which Christ died was a literal and not a figurative or "spiritual" one. Hence, the *death* which is declared to have been the state of "all" by nature was literal also. This is made still clearer by the following clauses:—"That they which *live should not henceforth live unto themselves*, but unto him that died for them and rose again." Whence it appears that the *life* which they obtained by the death of the Redeemer was not essentially *holiness* or *happiness* in itself, but a life which is to be stamped with those characters through a subsequent voluntary dedication of it to God. "*We thus judge*, that they which live, should not henceforth *live unto themselves.*"

In the same sense, therefore, we feel obliged to believe that the term is employed in the remaining passages:—Rom. vi. 13: "Yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, (*ek nekron zontas.*) 1 Tim. v. 6: "She that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth." (*Zosa tethneke.*) Rev. iii. 1, "Thou hast a name that thou livest and art dead," (*nekros ei.*) 1 John iii. 14: "We know that we have passed *from death* unto life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not his brother, *abideth in death.*"

The language of the Apostle Peter, however, affords the strongest confirmation to the foregoing interpretations. He thus writes: 1 Pet. i. 23: "*Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever;* 24, For *all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man is as the flower of the field; the grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away: But the word of the Lord endureth forever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you.*" It is obvious that in the twenty-fourth verse the apostle is giving a reason wherefore (*dioti*, for) we must be born again of the incorruptible seed of the word, which *liveth and abideth forever.* Because, says he, all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man is as the flower of the grass. The grass *withereth*, and the flower thereof *falleth away.* It is evident therefore, that he regarded man's *mortality and evanescence* as a ground for the necessity of regeneration, and he resolves the new birth into a participation of the *everlasting nature of the divine word:* "*But the word of the Lord endureth forever.*" And it seems equally clear, that the Apostle does not refer alone to the body when he declares that "all *flesh* is grass;" for he adds, that *all the glory* of man is as the flower of the glass; *it withereth; it falleth away;* and this surely must include the entire nature of man. It is scarcely possible to conceive a stronger mode of declaring that the whole present constitution of humanity is born of "corruptible" or perishable seed.

Under the ordinary view, which restricts the necessity for regeneration to the single circumstance of a corruption in the character of an immortal soul, this passage will afford but a feeble sense. "Being born again, renewed in the image of God's holiness, not of perishable but of imperishable seed, by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever. *For* all flesh is as grass, the body is mortal, and all the glory of man is as the flower of the grass. The grass withereth, the flower thereof falleth away, the pomp of worldliness will die, but the word of the Lord endureth forever." If the nature of man be already immortal, the Apostle's studious reference to the immortalizing power of the truth, seems altogether incongruous; whereas viewed in the light thrown upon it by the suggested interpretation the passage acquires a grand and perspicuous signification.

In full accordance with the preceding doctrine is our Lord's declaration to the Jews. John vi. 47:—

us from so great a death." So also, "destruction of the flesh," in 1 Cor. v. 5, is used for a *mortal disease.*

4. To be "*dead to*" anything, signifies *to cease to be, or to live in certain relationships to it.* "Dead to the world,"—"to sin,"—"to the Law." But the phrase "*dead to God,*" never occurs.

5. To *mortify*, or put to death, signifies to destroy the life of anything, either literally, or in the sense of its *activity and power;* as when it is said, "Nabal's heart became *dead* within him."

6. It has never been shown that *death* stands for a state of *misery*, or of *sinfulness, apart from the idea of that literal destruction, or death*, which is the "wages of sin."

7. The expression, *Spiritual death*, and the distinction between *temporal* and *eternal death*, are alike unknown to the Holy Scriptures. They are, we venture to think, the necessary creations of an erroneous theory.

"Verily I say unto you, he that believeth on me hath everlasting life. I am that Bread of Life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead: This is the bread that came down from heaven, that a man might eat thereof and not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven, if any man eat of this bread he shall live forever. And the bread which I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat? Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, Verily I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of Man, ye have no life in you," (*en eautois,*) in yourselves. These observations may enable us to attach their full meaning to our Lord's declaration to Nicodemus, John iii. 6: "That which is born of the flesh, *is flesh;*"—is of a corruptible and perishable, as well as of an animal nature. "Marvel not that I say unto thee, Ye must be born again."

Thus does the testimony of Scripture lead us to the conclusion, that the necessity for regeneration is founded upon the complex fact of man's moral *depravity* and *mortality of* nature. This fact is designated by the Apostle Paul, "the law of *sin* and *death;*" and it is also felicitously expressed in one word, which conveys both ideas, *Corruption;* "the bondage of corruption." Hence, by a distinct argument, we derive a confirmation of the foregoing reasonings concerning the fall of man and the scheme of redemption.

II. The way is now prepared for an inquiry into *the nature and results* of the great change of Regeneration: and the previous reasonings have, in some measure, anticipated the statement that it consists in *a renewal of the divine likeness in the character*, and, consequently upon that, in a *restoration to the hope of Immortality or everlasting life.*

1. The world at large, as we have seen, presents the awful spectacle of universal sinfulness and misery. Every human spirit is disorganized: the balance of its faculties is disturbed; and "peace, the central feeling of all happiness," has passed away. The image of God which shone upon the countenance of Adam in Paradise, has been exchanged for the likeness of the beasts which were subjected to his sway, or worse, for the likeness of "devilish" malignity and wickedness. The understanding understands no more; the memory will not remember the precepts of the Almighty, the heart goeth after its covetousness; selfishness has become the guiding principle of humanity; and habit has riveted its oppressive chains. It behoves us briefly to describe the moral process through which this degraded nature is prepared for "the inheritance of the saints in light;" for "*without holiness no man shall see the Lord.*"

"*The wisdom that is from above is first* PURE." The reclamation of the spirit from the thraldom of the animal nature is the earliest sign and consequence of Regeneration. When the glad tidings of salvation approach the sinner, they find him "the servant of corruption:" the lowest propensities of the flesh asserting a fearful predominance over the energies of the inner man. The faculties of his soul are deadened through vicious indulgence, and Sinful Pleasure is drawing him as with an irresistible spell along the fatal pathway of perdition. The light of conscience may indeed afford his unwilling eyes occasional tremendous glances at the issue of his course; yet the dreadful glare, which flashes for a moment over its termination, imparts no salutary power to resist the fascinations of the sorceress who is leading him to destruction. But when the Sovereign Almighty Spirit lends His divine assistance and touches the heart of man, this spell is broken; sensuality loses its attractions, and the mind asserts its right to command. How often have we beheld the countenance once bearing but too evident a testimony to the brutal slumber of the inhabitant within, brightening into divine animation, and lighted up with the intelligence of the awakening soul:—the delighted wonder of the emancipated victim, at the world of Truth presented to his gaze, resembling that which might follow the healing of the blind man, for the first time rejoicing in the spectacle of the heavenly hosts. And, even when the restraints and influences of a refined education may have checked the grosser outbreaks of pollution, how marked the difference between this accidental and constrained repression of the lower nature, and that internal, voluntary principle of purity, which results from the union of the "earthly man" with the Eternal Spirit! This is the first result of that ineffable influence which expels the "law of sin" from the character, and stamps the lovely image of the divine spirituality upon the regenerate soul.

Resemblance to the divine VERACITY AND RIGHTEOUSNESS is imparted by the same holy power. The bridling of the animal passions permits the intellectual part to develop its capacities, hitherto blunted and stupified by carnal vices:—and the intellect thus enfranchised turns by a *supernatural* instinct towards Truth as its proper and natural object. By nature, an utter carelessness as to the most important subjects reigns in the heart of man. Any opinions, that may be presented first, are esteemed good enough to be the guide of life;—whether they are wise or foolish, they are alike received and entertained without examination, as part of the inheritance, if only they are sanctioned by parental example and the authority of antiquity. Any scruples or difficulties which understanding or conscience may in early life suggest, are speedily silenced and exterminated by the dictates of interest, of fear, of shame, of sympathy. A servile imitation of the opinions of the former generation, ("*Badim which their fathers taught them,*") joined with the ever degenerating tendency of error, combine to increase at once the force and the danger of the prejudices thus received. The same spirit commonly pervades teachers and the taught. In the one, as amongst the Brahmins, a superstitious dread of impugning the sentiments which are sanctioned by the accumulated weight of the belief of many centuries and generations, is exhibited in a fierce defiance of any adversaries who may arise; in a boundless arrogance of denunciation, which clothes itself, perhaps, in the swelling importance of a pagan "orthodoxy," without the least respect to its own personal insignificance, or to the solidity and value of the objections that may be adduced. Thus is it, also, that in Europe we daily hear certain ancient "delusions" defended, the one half of which offer violence to every dictate of man's understanding, the other half, to every moral sentiment of his heart: defended by scorn, by falsehood, by vehement contumelious reproaches, by every weapon which can serve to illustrate how small a share profound and calm conviction has in all the demonstration. For he who knows the intricacy of that labyrinth in which mankind is born, and the steepness of the ways of truth, will best appreciate the difficulties of the earnest inquirer, will be the first to show how *gentle* heavenly wisdom is, and will most readily perceive how little storms of indignant zeal are able to reclaim the wandering or maintain the right. Such, however, unhappily, is the usual method in which the diversified

fabrics of opinion are upheld, whether in heathen or professedly Christian lands; and we need not be surprised that the inevitable result, in the minds of the multitude, is to breed a carelessness as to intellectual integrity, through a dread of the overwhelming punishment which avenges independent inquiry. Truth itself comes to be held in the spirit of falsehood; not because of its evidence, but because it is orthodox; not from conviction, but from deference to a universal opinion. Articles are hypocritically professed which, when brought in close contact with the common understanding, array against themselves the whole force of its determinations: and each man submits his soul to be wielded by the vulgar crowd, although, perhaps, if inclined to pride, he may hold in contempt and detestation nearly every individual of which that crowd is composed.

The entrance of heavenly grace, however, gradually produces a sublime revolution. *In the case of the religious teacher* the dishonesty is, generally speaking, cast away. Truth everywhere, Truth always, and Truth at all hazards, becomes the object of his soul. He learns of God to disdain equally the cowardly submission which conceals solemn convictions, or adopts a creed against which his mind revolts; and the diabolical pride which would impose a creed on others irrespective of their consciences. He learns to dread that awful day when the righteous God shall light up the bosoms of assembled mankind, and display the secrets of all hearts before the creation: when no capacities for metaphysical equivocation will avail to cover with excuses the frightful guilt of him who has withheld the whole counsel of God, or interposed the clouds of his philosophy, between the souls of men and God's intelligible justice, wisdom, and love; or who has confused by his speculations the natural dictates of "the law written on the heart." *And in the case of the multitude*, the practical change induced by regeneration is equally conspicuous. Before, the understanding yielded an easy assent to every proposition in religion, alike uninterested in them all: now the faculties of the soul turn upon the poles of sincerity and truth. The mind which formerly found its "chief joy" in fictions of the imagination, or in the falsehoods which palliate "the exceeding sinfulness of sin," now humbly advances towards the Father of Lights, and carries on a solemn communion with the *Author of Life*, as the great Reality denoted by all the types and shadows of the material universe around. The regenerate man, when "perfect," passes at once from words to thoughts, from symbols to the things signified. He submits to the evidence which leads him to the dictates of divine authority, and to nothing less. The spirit of transparent integrity animates and pervades his soul. He turns aside from the wilderness of the world, from the dreary waste of barren formality and heartless custom; and, *"putting off his shoes from his feet,"* contemplates for himself *"that great sight,"* that Flaming Fire which burns without support, THE SELF-EXISTENT WISDOM, POWER, GOODNESS OF JEHOVAH:—and when, returning from the resplendent vision, his countenance is illuminated by the transforming radiance, as it were "the face of an angel," the worst of worldly men will frequently confess the unearthly dignity of a religion which commences in the ardent love of Truth, and leads to vital intercourse with its Original.

This grand renovation necessarily includes the impartation of *dignity and courage*. "The sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty" display the evidence of their heavenly birth by that magnanimous nobility of disposition and demeanor which becomes the "offspring of God." An open, fearless countenance, a graceful mingling of humility and conscious greatness, a divine harmonious conjunction of mildness and forbearance with lion-like boldness in the pursuit of truth or duty, attest the celestial origin of a character which puts to shame the meanness of the world's heroes, with their petty arts of tyranny and fraud. An elevation of mind which regards with unconcern the frowns of the whole human race, and which aspires to an unchangeable abode amongst those *things which are unseen and eternal*, at once arms the regenerate man against the opposition of earth and hell, and teaches him to place his happiness above the regions which littleness can reach or malice disturb. The true Christian is a soldier, and his life is a difficult campaign. Every day brings its circumstances of trial, in advantages to be foregone, in sacrifices to be offered, in sufferings to be endured, in scorn and hatred to be encountered, in principles to be maintained, in labors to be undergone, and in triumphs to be achieved. It is a conflict in which unaided nature fails, but in which, *"strengthened with all might by the Spirit in his inner man,"* the genuine believer is made "more than a conquerer through Him which hath loved him."

## "CHRIST DIED."

BY THOMAS READ, NEW YORK.

*"He asked life of thee*, and thou gavest it him, *even length of days for ever and ever."* Ps. 21: 4. "WHEN THOU shalt make *his soul and offering for sin*, he shall see his seed, he shall *prolong his days*, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand. He shall see of the *travail of his soul*, and shall be satisfied, * * * *because* he hath poured out his *soul unto death.*" Isa. 53: 10.

We suppose that the whole of the 21st psalm refers to Christ. This was the 'travail of his soul' then—the 'strong crying and tears.' He asked LIFE of God and a numerous progeny, or as the Vulgate reads, 'a long-lived seed,' which of course he could not have asked if he or they were already immortal. When God had given his Son, and had made his soul an offering for sin, God had no living Son, who was the Lord's anointed One, in existence. But having prophetically promised that he would prolong Christ's days, he 'raised him from the dead,' and then Christ being made perfect by being invested with an incorruptible and glorified body, God declared of him, 'Thou art my Son; this day (the day of his resurrection) have I begotten thee' from the grave. Acts 13: 33. And 'because Christ humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross; wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name.' As Christ has been begotten from the grave, so we 'in the regeneration' shall be begotten from the grave, and then will Christ 'see his seed' and 'be satisfied;' and then will he say, Behold I and the children whom thou hast given me,' who are the incorruptible saints, for they are the children of God, 'being the children of the resurrection.' And as Christ will then have given 'eternal life to as many as God has given him,' they will become the children of him who is the 'resurrection and the life.'

This solves all the difficulties in Heb. 5: 7. If Christ ceased to live, and became utterly unconscious, then 'Christ died according to the scriptures, and was raised again the third day,' and proved to be the Son of God with power. 'And if Christ died, and rose again, even so, those that sleep in Jesus,

(are unconscious in the grave,) shall God bring with him'—at his second coming. It is therefore evident that Jesus was not raised from the dead by any inherent, or adhering, or separated principle, or power, belonging exclusively to him in his humiliation; he being entirely under the dominion of death; but by the omnipotent energy of the Eternal Father, and was declared to be the Son of God with power. This same Jesus Christ will come in the clouds of heaven to raise the dead to life and consciousness.

But was not Christ immortal? Most certainly not, else he could not have died for us, and thereby made an atonement for our sins. But was not his soul immortal? No, emphatically NO; for his soul was himself, his life, the very thing that was poured out unto death, and which made the sacrifice available. We have proved that Christ died, nevertheless we must reiterate, 'God ONLY hath immortality.' 'As the LIVING FATHER hath sent me, and *I live by the Father*, even so, he that eateth me, even he *shall live by me.*' 'He asked life of thee; and thou gavest it him, even *length of days for ever and ever.*' 'As the Father hath life in himself, so hath *he given* to the Son to have life in himself.' 'I am he that liveth and *was dead;* and behold, I am *alive* for evermore. Amen; and have the *keys* of death and the *grave.*'

Although Christ was not immortal in his own nature, he has become the first fruits of immortality; the first begotten of the dead; he is the first man that has arisen from the dead with a spiritual, or incorruptible, and therefore an immortal body. For Christ being raised from the dead, *dieth no more*—death hath *no more dominion over him.*

The doctrine of the non-immortality of Christ prior to his crucifixion, and his submission to the entire deprivation of life for a period, and his resurrection again to life, not by his own inherent power, but by the power of God, is the very foundation of the gospel. Paul contrasts the faith by which a man is saved with the righteousness that comes by the law. Rom. 10: 5. We quote from Griesbach, 'For Moses writeth of the righteousness which is of the law. The man that doeth those things shall live by them.' But alas! no man complies with these conditions. But the righteousness which is of faith speaketh thus, 'Say not in thy heart; Who shall ascend into heaven? That is, to bring Christ down; or who shall descend into the bottomless pit? That is, to bring back Christ from the dead. But what saith it? The word is nigh to thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart; that is the word of faith, *which we preach*, that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth that Jesus is Lord, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou wilt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth he confesseth unto salvation. For the scripture saith, 'Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed.''

It becomes, then, a serious question, Can any person that believes Jesus always to have been immortal, and that his body only died, while his soul remained conscious, and that he, on the morning of the resurrection, again re-united himself or his soul or his spirit to his dead body by his own inherent power, that 'he burst the bars of death,' we say can such a man believe in his heart that God raised Christ from the dead. Paul says, 1 Cor. 15: 2, that we are saved by holding these fundamental truths of the gospel; that *Christ died* for our sins *according to the scriptures*, which assert that his *soul* was made an offering for sin, his *soul* was poured out unto death; that *he was buried*, and that *he* rose from the dead the third day. Alas! how few believe that Christ truly died. But some will still say, was it not the body of Jesus Christ that was once offered? Yes, verily; but in offering the body he offered himself, his life, the Holy One; he could not offer his body without pouring out his soul unto death. 'So CHRIST (the whole of Christ) was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without [a sin offering] unto salvation.' The scriptures do not inform us that God gave only a human body, but that God gave his Son. This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses.

But some will still object and refer to John 10: 18. 'I lay down my life for the sheep. * * * Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father.' 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.' These passages will bear this explanation. I voluntarily submit to death; to lay down my life for the sake of the sheep. And I can confidently commend my spirit or life to the care of my Father, for he has given me power to live again; therefore, he will not leave my soul in Sheol; but will raise me from the dead. The implied objection of the opponent that Jesus must have been conscious to have resumed his own life, is equal to saying that Jesus did not lay down his life.

Merely the laying down of a human body, which Christ had assumed only for a short period, and which was the accompaniment of toil and sorrow, and the continual cause of anxiety, and which, it is assumed, is only a clog to full spiritual development. as the soul when separated has more knowledge and more happiness, and has more enlarged capacities without than with the body, (we write it reverently in the thorough conviction that it was not so,) if an inanimate body that did not constitute the whole man—Christ Jesus—was given merely, it was no great gift after all—a small price for the redemption of a world—a slender foundation for our faith and hopes to rest upon. Upon this supposition it would not be true that God gave his *Son* to die for our sins; for his body without his soul was not his Son. Neither would it be true that God raised *him* from the dead.

—o—

FROM THOMAS BIRCH.

*Hartford, Conn.*, June 1, 1851.

BR. STORRS:—I received a letter from my aunt Evans, in England, a short time ago. I am happy to inform you that she is rejoicing in the belief of that truth you have labored so hard to promulgate, i. e. "No Immortality out of Christ." She says she is amazed when reading all the Epistles, that she could be so stupid as not to understand better; but that she is like many more, and can give no other reason than that she has been taught by her would-be spiritual *guides*. Oh! are they not blind leaders of the blind? It is distressing to me to think that both the *leader* and the *led* must fall into the ditch. As we see so many of our fellow-creatures walking in heathenish darkness, how it becomes those of us who have the light of divine *truth* to let it *shine*. Peradventure, I might be an instrument in the hand of our God of saving at least one of our fellow-mortals from stumbling headlong into the ditch of perdition.

I am glad you have sent me your new paper, the Truth-Seeker. Will you please continue it to my address.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, AUGUST, 1851.

"AGES TO COME."—If we speak of "*The Age to Come,*" some persons appear to think we have coined a new phrase, and wonder we cannot keep to scriptural expressions. We think such people are much too sensitive. If the expression "ages to come" is a scriptural one, it certainly cannot be unscriptural to speak of one of those ages in particular; for if there are ages to come, there must be one that is nearer than the others, and that one is "the age to come." The Apostle Paul tells us of some things that were "hid from *ages* and from generations, but are now made manifest." So there have been ages in the past: see Col. 1: 26. He speaks also of "eternal life which God promised before the world [*pro chronon aionion*—before *the ages*] began." Tit. 1: 2. Again, he says, God has "made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus, that in the *ages* to come he might show the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness towards us through Christ Jesus." Eph. 2: 6–7. Once more he saith "Unto Him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout *all ages*, world without end;" or, as McKnight translates it, "throughout the *endless succession of ages.*" Eph. 3: 21.

In all this there is surely good and scriptural ground for speaking of "the age to come," and the language of the apostle wakes up our thoughts to speak of "*the ages.*" In the sense in which Paul uses this term, we understand periods of time in which some peculiar work was done, or manifestation was made.

The history of this world has been divided into periods, or ages; each of which has had its peculiarities and epoch. They have had a marked beginning and termination. We design to notice in the first place, briefly, the ages past.

1. THE ADAMIC AGE.—This was from the creation to the fall. The length of this age we have no means of ascertaining. That it occupied some little space of time is clear. We are not to suppose that Adam fell the first day of his creation, there must have been some time for all the developments to be made that are there recorded. Some have supposed that sixteen years elapsed; but though that seems little time enough, yet it is wholly conjectural. Whether little or much time is taken up in that period, it was an age, and the age of the trial of our first parents, and their expulsion from the Garden of Eden.

2. THE ANTEDILUVIAN AGE.—This commenced with the expulsion from Eden. It was an age which resulted in a total apostacy from God except one family. This age covered a period variously estimated from fifteen hundred to two thousand years. God during all this period was striving with men by his spirit, which they resisted, hardening themselves in wickedness till wrath came upon them and swept them all away with a flood; there that age terminated.

3. FROM NOAH TO ABRAHAM may be denominated the *third* age. This was marked with its peculiarities. It commenced with Noah's advent from the Ark, and, like the previous age, was marked in its progress with almost a total apostacy of Noah's posterity. God had said, however, that he would no more "smite everything living as he had done." Another method was now to be tried to keep alive a seed in the earth that should acknowledge and worship the true and living God, and Abraham was called to go out from his countrymen and kindred to a strange land, and he went out at God's command, not knowing whither he went. This brings us to the

4th, OR PATRIARCHAL AGE.—The commencement of this age was marked by the call and departure of Abraham from Chaldea to go into Canaan, and is filled up with the most interesting incidents, viz: the covenants with Abraham—the birth and offering up of Isaac—the birth of Jacob, with the many and thrilling scenes recorded of these Patriarchs in the history of their lives and death, the multiplication of their posterity and their ultimate bondage in Egypt. Great and glorious developments were made during this age, which serve as a key to unlock all the succeeding ones to the present time and coming age. This age is marked in its termination by the advent of Abraham's posterity, through Jacob, from their bondage from Egypt and settlement in Palestine; and covered a period of five hundred years or more.

5. THE MOSAIC AGE.—This commenced with the deliverance of Israel out of Egypt, and embraces all the interesting events recorded in the Old Testament, relative to that people and the surrounding nations, pointing forward to "ages to come," both of humiliation and glory to that people and their Messiah. That age continued till the first advent of Messiah and the overthrow of the Jewish or Mosaic polity at the destruction of Jerusalem, and was filled up with most interesting developments, or manifestations of God's truth, power, and faithfulness.

6. THE GOSPEL AGE—*The ministration of the spirit and calling of the Gentiles.*—This commenced with the personal ministry of Messiah—was more fully opened on the day of Penticost, but not perfectly developed till Paul became the minister to the Gentiles. It has been an age, emphatically, of contest between the *flesh* and the Spirit; or between the *animal* propensities of men and the Spirit waking in the mind, or in the affections. In this age many have been sealed by the Spirit and have overcome the world, the flesh, and the devil, but the vast majority of men, as in the previous ages, have walked after their own lusts, and refused the cross of Christ. The love of

the praise of men; the thirst for wealth, fame, power, or sensual enjoyment, has carried captive the largest part of men and drowned them in perdition; and all well grounded hope of this world, or its inhabitants, ever being recovered from Satan's dominion by the efforts of men in the flesh, i. e., by corruptible and dying men, whatever stations they may occupy, is vain. All such efforts have proved a failure; and unless a new age or dispensation is opened, the world fails of being regenerated—Satan is triumphant, and prophecy fails. So we understand the matter. But we have no doubt another age is to succeed this; or, that there is an "*age to come*," in which God's great purpose in creating the world and testing men under such a variety of dispensations, or ages, shall be fully developed, and Messiah's personal reign and glory, with his people who bore the cross, in previous ages, shall demonstrate that there is a power that can control men and cause them to be subject to God, to the everlasting confusion and discomfiture of Satan and all his fleshly-minded followers. The present age, then, will end or terminate with the *return* of Messiah to this earth to take the throne of David, to reign and execute judgment and justice in the earth. This brings us to the

7. AGE OF MESSIAH'S PERSONAL REIGN; its commencement is the *seventh* great epoch in this world's history, and is "the age to come;" being still future, though we are so near to it that its light dawns upon us, and the watchful will not fail to see its approach.

This age opens with the termination of the times of the Gentiles treading under foot Jerusalem—the overthrow of the present earthly monarchies—the return of God's favor to Palestine and Jerusalem—the gathering of the outcasts of Israel—the personal advent of Messiah as King of kings and Lord of lords—the assumption by him of the throne of Israel or David's throne, and his dominion over the earth, together with the resurrection and immortalization of all them that are his, who have suffered with him or for his words in any of the previous ages.

It embraces, in its progress, the destruction of all incorrigible enemies, and the subjugation of all nations to him and his government; it terminates by a revolt among the inhabitants of the earth, through a new effort of the Satanic power, resulting in their being destroyed by fire from heaven—the final judgment being *executed* on all God's enemies, and the full regeneration of the earth, so that it shall be said, "Behold, I make all things new," and "*it is done.*" At that point we are brought to the borders of another age, which is a perfect one, when compared with any of the preceding, but is only one in a chain, or "endless succession of ages;" each of which, doubtless, will exceed the one going before it in glory and glorious developments; thus opening to the view an endless prospect of inexhaustible enjoyment, and making the hope of *eternal life* a hope full of glory, and needing no endless torments to make it more blissful. All the wicked will have passed away and perished forever, and all surviving creatures in heaven, in earth, and in all God's dominions will be filled with joy and unending delight.

Such we conceive to be the true scripture doctrine, but we have not time or space now to go more largely into the subject.

———o———

"PNEUMATOLOGIST."—FROM THOMAS SMITH.

*Br. Storrs:*—I perceive that Br. J. Litch, of your city of "Brotherly Love," in his "Pneumatologist" for May, has a long dialogue between "Materialist" and himself; and in the second part of the same number has the dialogue continued between "Destructionist" and "Pneumatologist." He, of course, as was intended, has mastered, in a most triumphant manner, his opponent, who has acknowledged his error and renounced the same. This is as it should be, when men find themselves in an error, for error can do us no good, but much hurt. You will perceive by consulting the number for May, page 274, his criticism on Mark ix. "*Asbestos*," he says, instead of being "*unquenchable*," is "*unconsumable.*" Again, page 275, he says: "The object of salt on flesh is to *preserve* it from *putrefaction*, and this same office fire shall fill in the case of sinners in Gehenna. The idea is terrible." Horrible indeed! yet if truth we must receive it. Thus, "*salt preserves meat—so fire preserves the sinner in the fire forever.*" So thinks Br. J. Litch.

Yours in hope of Eternal Life.

*Wellfleet, Mass.*, July 11th, 1851.

REMARKS BY THE EDITOR.—When Br. Smith's letter was received, we had no knowledge of the May number of the Pneumatologist, as we had neither seen nor heard of it. We have since procured and read it. "Materialist" in the dialogue would have been much more appropriately named "*Pliable*," after Bunyan's character of that name. Very little that this *pliable* character says is a quotation from writers on the side we advocate; but some weak disputant's private discourse, very likely, is the basis of most that "Pliable" says.

We think so far as "Pliable" has a real existence, we know who he is; and a man of no more stability than he possesses we should expect would talk as he does in that dialogue with the help of a little coloring; for Pneu. seldom quotes the exact words of his opponents, though they may be the words of "Pliable," for we shall call him by that name. We let the first dialogue pass with the single remark, that nearly every point in it, on Pneumatologist's side, has been met and refuted, in our judgment, in the Bible Examiner, in the past volumes; in particular in the Examiner for 1850, page 77–80, and 97–101, and in the article on "Demonology," in the January number of the present year. Some points which Pneu. says none of the writers on the other side from him, have ever noticed, we have met more than once, as he may find if he will examine the back volumes of our paper. On the subject of "Demons,"

page 66–69, Pneu. has some remarks that perhaps should be noticed, not because of their weight, but because "Pliable" and himself are so completely enveloped in the mists raised by a play on words. Pneu. quotes from Peter and Jude to show that the "knocking spirits" cannot be the "fallen angels," because Jude says the angels that kept not their first estate are "reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day." So, Pneu. says, "those angels are *confined!*" How *literal!* We wish he knew how to be so on other plain and positive texts that overthrow his theory. But, no, "they mean something else!" But the fallen angels are "chained"—"confined;" and "the Bible," he says, "teaches no plurality of *devils* or Satans. Diabolos and Satanus are always in the singular number. But he has * * a multitude of angels."

Here are some curious admissions or assertions. We have answered the notion of only "*one* Satan." See Examiner for Jan., p. 12. But one or many, how came he *loose!* The fallen angels are all "in chains"—"confined," Pneu. says. Is Satan or Diabolos a fallen angel? If so, how, we ask again, came he loose? for Peter assures us that he "*goeth about* seeking whom he may devour." And if he is not "confined" in the sense Pneu. asserts of the "angels who kept not their first estate," how can he prove any of those angels are *so confined* as he wished to make *Pliable* believe? That mind must be pliable indeed that cannot see through so thin a web as Pneu. uses on this point. As to the "multitude of Satan's angels," what help are they to him if *confined* as literally as Pneu. affirms? Surely they cannot, in that case, "*go about:*" and then what follows? Why, *one* of these fallen angels, viz: *Diabolos*, has broke loose, or God has let him loose—so that his chains were not *everlasting*, literally—and now he "goeth about," and yet is *omnipresent;* for all Christians are exhorted to be vigilant, "*because* your adversary the devil (Diabolos) goeth about," &c. We might press this point, but we judge we have said enough to show that poor *Pliable* had some disease on his vision so quietly to succumb to such an argument.

We now leave these small matters to notice the *criticism* on the Greek term *Asbestos*, Mark 9: 43–48. "The fire is *not quenched.*" Pneu. says (page 274) "*Asbestos*, instead of being unquenchable, is *unconsumable!*" Again, page 275, he says on Mark 9: 45, "*Eis ten Gehenna, eis to pur to asbeston*—into Gehenna, into the fire *asbestos*, which would be fire *unconsumable.*"

This is imposing, truly; and it has one advantage, it is an *independent* criticism so far as we have any knowledge. It may be *borrowed*, but we think not. We are sure it is not borrowed from the English language, nor from any Greek Lexicon that we have examined; and as Pneu. gives us no *authority*, we conclude it his own *private interpretation.* Paul saith, Heb. 12: 29, "Our God is a *consuming* fire"—*pur katanaliskon*, from *kata*, intens., *ana*, up, and *leicho*, to lick. *To lick up, to devour, to consume. Asbestos*, Mark 9: 43–48, is from *a*, negative, and *sbennumi*, to extinguish, unquenchable, inoxtinguishable; and has no such meaning as *unconsumable;* and the term *unconsumable* does not occur in the Greek Testament, that we can find; but consume, devour, etc., do. Till Pneu., therefore, gives us some authority besides his own *private* one, we shall quietly go on, even though a dozen *Pliables* confess their mistakes.

If the reader wish to see more fully the impossibility of making the Greek term *unconsummable* instead of unquenchable, let him turn to Ezek. 20: 47, 48; Jer. 7: 20; and Jer. 17: 27, in which places the Septuagint has *sbesthesetai;* there he will see the same form of expression as in Mark 9, and be able to judge for himself whether it means *unconsumable* fire. The very idea of an *unconsumable* fire is a contradiction; but no such idea is found in the Bible. Fire may burn without consuming through a special interposition of God; but an *unquenchable fire* is always used to denote a *consuming fire.*

To argue that because "salt preserves flesh," therefore being "salted with fire preserves the sinner," when the clear testimony of scripture contradicts the idea of preservation, looks like being hard pressed. For if that argument is worth anything at this point, it proves equally that the righteous are *preserved* by fire as well as the wicked, for the Saviour adds, "*Salt is good:* but if the salt have lost its saltness, wherewith will ye season it? Have salt in yourselves." So this *fire-salt is* "*good*" and the disciples are exhorted to have it "*in* themselves," and "*every one* shall be salted with fire." The truth is, the salt in this text is not the "fire of Gehenna"—"the unquenchable fire"—which consumed whatever was cast therein. There are two kinds of fire spoken of in the scripture; one, the fire of Gehenna, which consumes, and into which all sinners will be cast; and the fire of God's love, concerning which the Psalmist said, "While I mused the fire burned;" this preserves, and is the true salt which preserves from putrefaction or corruption; but the other, the unquenchable fire, destroys, eats up.

The remainder of the dialogue with "Destructionist," alias *Pliable*, we regard as fully answered by our Six Sermons and other works that have been published on the subject, and we leave those works to do battle with all the mighty arguments which made Pliable so easy a conquest. The truth is, Pliable had placed himself in such circumstances that he courted a conversion to the old theory, and only wished a decent apology to go back where he might fare better with certain men than he had while laboring for the grand truth of the gospel, viz:

"Life only through
we know well who
reward."

"MYSTERIOUS RA
derland says, in hi
"We know that s
sentences. They r
hands, but they d
*we know to be the fa*
ily many, very mar
We do not call it
city at all in the m
truth. Again he s
"That it is *possi*
sounds, so as to ev
certain, as it has b
where."
Here again we a
regret he had no
shows that angels
with them in a mo
They may have a
Sunderland or his
it. We think the
to "evolve words,'
than to be *thumpin*
their worshippers
plainly uttered.
perfectly manifest
this "spiritual de
angels," as it is t
shipper of the livi
is that saying of o
this world are ir
children of light."
worshippers assen
in silence, strivin
will of the spirits
hours to get resp
The most devoted
under any circun
wait in this manne
we hear of these
guage of Satan to
and *worship me*, a
"worshipping of a
which he hath n
time; and such, h
mility," but were
mind:" Col. 2: 18.
to this course, bu
instrument of Sata
becoming "subject
ments and doctrin
tion in saying th
speaking, are *circ*
no wonder if their

"Life only through Christ." We speak advisedly; we know well who Pliable is, and "verily he has his reward."

———o———

"MYSTERIOUS RAPPINGS."—PROGRESS.—Mr. Sunderland says, in his paper, p. 185:—

"We know that spirits or angels write letters and sentences. They not only do this by moving human hands, but they do it without human hands. *This we know to be the fact*, It has been done in our family many, very many times."

We do not call in question Mr. Sunderland's veracity at all in the matter; we doubt not he states the truth Again he saith, same page:—

"That it is *possible* for angels to make articulate sounds, so as to evolve words to the external ear, is certain, as it has been done in our family and elsewhere."

Here again we accord to him truthfulness; but we regret he had not appealed to the Bible, which shows that angels did appear to men and converse with them in a most familiar manner in olden times. They may have appeared to and talked with Mr. Sunderland or his "family;" we shall not question it. We think they would act much more consistent to "evolve words," distinctly, "to the external ear" than to be *thumping* floors, tables, &c. But of course their worshippers are not at first prepared for words plainly uttered. We say *worshippers*, for it is as perfectly manifest to our mind that the devotees to this "spiritual development" are "worshippers of angels," as it is that the sincere Christian is a worshipper of the living and true God. In this matter is that saying of our Lord true, that "the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light." Only think! A company of spirit worshippers assemble together, form their *circle*, sit in silence, striving to be perfectly resigned to the will of the spirits, and waiting in this manner for hours to get responses, or to have *communications!* The most devoted Christian can hardly be induced, under any circumstances, to humble himself and wait in this manner. We cannot help thinking when we hear of these circles thus waiting, of the language of Satan to our Lord, "If thou wilt fall down and *worship me*, all shall be thine." This patient "worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen," was practised in Paul's time; and such, he says, practised "a *voluntary* humility," but were "vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind:" Col. 2: 18. It was not *spirituality* that led to this course, but want of it; it was the *flesh*, that instrument of Satan; it is a departing from God and becoming "subject to ordinances after the commandments and doctrines of men." We have no hesitation in saying that all the *circles* of which we are speaking, are *circles* of devil worshippers; and it is no wonder if their lord and master, into whose service they so solemnly initiate themselves, should *write* to them, or "evolve words to" their "external ear," when he has sealed up their hearts against God and his Christ. It is very true Satan seldom ever appears *as* Satan to those whom he dupes. Why should he? He knew better than to do so the very first time he ever practised his arts on the human race; he took then an unsuspected position, and hid himself in the serpent, a *beast*, not then unlovely as now, but the most *wise* of "any beast of the field." His object then, professionally, was to make man *wiser*—give him more *knowledge* or *light*—and make him happier than his Creator had done. Thus man was seduced from perfect confidence in God his maker to rely upon a quicker process for knowledge than Jehovah saw good for him. So now, "fall down and worship me" is the language of the spirit-rappers, "and all shall be thine"—all the knowledge of the "*spheres* above" you! Mistaken devotees! Their ways are ways of death! We write not now for their benefit, though we sincerely pity them, but if by any means we may save some unsuspecting souls from the awful pit to which they are hastening, who go after or follow this satanic development, thinking it may be "an angel of light."

First. It is settled in our mind that there is "*no knowledge* in sheol," the state of the dead; for "the dead praise not the Lord"—"in sheol who shall give Thee thanks?" Eccl. 9: 10; Psa. 115: 17; and 6: 5. This point being settled, these communications are not from any of the human race who once lived in the flesh. Then, second. Who are they? They are not angels of God, or good angels, because they do LIE; if in no other particular they do so in affirming they are the spirits of dead men, and advancing in knowledge, in plain contradiction to the Spirit of God in the Bible. There is then only one alternative, either to maintain that the whole manifestation is sleight of hand practised by some secret art, or it is the work of the devil. We are satisfied it is the latter; in other words, that though there may be deception connected with some of the professed manifestations, there is really a working out of Satanic power, that some, having rejected God's truth, may believe a lie and perish.

But who is to blame for this deception coming on man? We unhesitatingly answer, those who teach man has an immortal soul that survives death, and is more knowing than while in the body. These have laid the foundation, and supplied the materials for this Satanic development. We give the following specimen of the effects of this immortal soul theory, showing how it makes void the resurrection and converts God's "judgment of *condemnation*" into a theme of thanksgiving. We cut it from an *orthodox* paper. Here it is just as it is headed in that paper:

*Consoling Idea of Death.*—"I congratulate you and myself," wrote John Foster to a friend, "that life is

passing fast away. What a superlatively grand and consoling idea is that of death! Without this radiant idea, this delightful morning star, indicating that the luminary of eternity is going to rise, life would to my view darken into midnight melancholy. Oh? the expectation of living *here*, and living *thus*, always, would be indeed a prospect of overwhelming despair. But thanks to that decree that dooms us to die—thanks to that gospel which opens the vision of an endless life, and thanks, above all, to that Saviour friend who has promised to conduct all the faithful through the sacred trance of death into scenes of everlasting delight."

Where has the Saviour promised to conduct any man "through the sacred trance of death into scenes of everlasting delight?" He that believeth in Christ he has promised "I will raise HIM *up at the last day*." It is a monstrous perversion of God's truth to use it as is done in this "consoling idea of death." Praising God for "dooming us to die!" What blasphemy this. Death was a penalty—a fearful penalty; but the serpent preached "Ye shall not surely die"—you are immortal; and this idea substantially passes for truth among Christians, and they are now reaping the fruits of such teaching in the "rapping spirits," which bids fair to sweep many professors of religion down the whirlpool to perdition.

———o———

FROM A. L. SWEET.

*Mount Sterling*, Ill., June 23, 1851.

BRO. STORRS:—I send you one dollar for the Bible Examiner, beginning with this year. I am remarkably well pleased with it, because you take the bible just as it reads, without any alteration or amendments. I would be glad if about one half or two-thirds of it were devoted to other great truths of the bible that have been equally neglected or twisted. The life and death question has become old. After one becomes convinced, they want something else to keep them interested; something on the practical duties of Christians, &c. The great question that Luther called the "keystone to Popery" can still be kept rolling. I was glad to see your Truth-Seeker. We need something in this State like it. Our periodicals are quite averse to truth, unless it suit orthodoxy. I became convinced from reading the Bible that a Christian ought not to be connected in any way with government—that he ought not to fight under any circumstances, and that he ought not to be "unequally yoked together with unbelievers" in any society of human origin. I contended that we were pilgrims and strangers on the earth—that our King was now an exile, and until he returned we should continue to be so. I sent a communication to our Baptist paper in this State, on the subject; he did not notice it. I suppose he saw at a glance that it was contrary to *Baptist usage*, and probably thought, as many others do, that religion should keep pace with everything else. Bro. Penkake and myself wrote to Bro. Himes to put forth something on the subject. He replied he did not view these things as we did, and thought best to confine his paper to the one subject—Christ coming. *Query.*—What good does it do to tell people the Lord is coming and not tell them how to escape it? Since you have taken a stand against the notion of "double entity." Should you not, when speaking of yourself, use *I* instead of *we*? I think you should, unless you still believe there are two of you. Is it proper to call any one reverend, unless it can be shown that they have immortality and eternal life dwelling in them? I think not.

REMARKS BY THE EDITOR.—*We* did use the *singular* pronoun in the Examiner editorially up to 1848, and then concluded to use the *plural singular*, if such an expression is allowable; by which is meant that the singular person is represented by a pronoun in the plural form; it does not deceive any one, as it is understood by all, and Br. Sweet never thinks the editor is two because this form is used, as is manifest from his letter. One word in defence of this form. First. It looks less like egotism than "*I*," which often disgusts. Second. It is not unscriptural for a writer to use the plural form. Paul did it. See Gal. 1: 8; 1 Cor. 9: 11, 12, and other places. It is true that he usually employs the singular form—but one clear use of the plural in speaking of himself establishes the fact that there is no wrong in using that form, and hence it becomes a mere matter of taste or choice.

As to the use of the term "*Rev.*", that may be sinful or otherwise, according to the intention or motive of him who uses it. Formerly we rejected it altogether, and now do not wish to see it connected with George Storrs, but we do sometimes use it to avoid circumlocution in speaking of others. Some write "Minister of the Gospel;" that is all we mean when we employ "Rev." It stands for that, and nothing more, with us, and so it is generally understood by all men. If others mean any more by it we are not aware of it, and *they* must be answerable for the sense they give it. If it were prohibited in the Bible, that would be a sufficient reason for abandoning it wholly. The term "reverend" occurs but once in the Bible, viz: Psa. 111: 9, "Holy and reverend is His name." The original word, *Nouro*, here literally signifies "fearful, terrible." In this sense it cannot be applied to any man without sinning. We are not to regard any creature in this light, whether good or bad. We use the term as Br. Sweet does the term "Elder," which he wrote on the envelope of his letter to us. He might have been mistaken in the fact of our Eldership; still, it expressed, we presume, his meaning, viz: that "Geo. Storrs, Philadelphia, Pa.," is a "Minister of the Gospel." "Elder" is a scriptural term, but is never there used in the *form* he used it. It is never said *Elder* Paul, *Elder* Peter, &c. But it does not therefore follow it is wrong, much less sinful, to use it in the form he has. We have thought that this pressing points not plainly settled by Bible language would only serve as an excuse, to some men, for not believing the important truths which are contrary to their traditions. They conclude as we have no clear testimony on such points as those we have just noticed that other points, however clearly proved by scripture testimony, are equally unimportant, be-

cause advocated by the same persons. Though that is false reasoning, yet *traditionists* are always ready to "catch at straws" to save themselves and their sinking cause.

One other point in Br. Sweet's letter we will just note—his desire to have a large part of the Examiner devoted to "other great neglected truths of the Bible." It has been our object first to present the "Life and Death" question; because we believe the errors on that subject lie at the root of all other corruptions of Christianity and Bible truth. If we can establish the truth, that there is nothing but death—*extinction of being*—by the first Adam, and that life and immortality can only be gained by Jesus Christ, the second Adam, and that *out of him* there is no *endless* life or conscious existence, then we have planted a battery—not carnal, but spiritual—that will demolish the whole superstructure built on the declaration "Ye shall not surely die." Naturally following this work is, "If any man be in Christ he is a new creature," and receiving life divine from this new source, he must bring forth fruit that is Christ-like, otherwise his pretence of being in Christ is false and vain. A man can no more be in Christ and not be laboring to be like Christ in meekness, patience, long-suffering, love and obedience than a branch can live that does not partake of the sap of the vine.

———o———

"LIFE IN CHRIST, *by Edward White*," England.—We suggested in our last that we should be glad to see this work republished entire in this country, but that we had no funds to do it. We hoped there might be a response from those who are able to help. There can be no doubt it would do immense good—especially among the Congregationalists and Presbyterians. Br. White, as we understand it, is a Congregational Minister. In approaching different Christians, we must bear in mind that there exists a prejudice in most minds against views coming from other denominations; and views differing from those they have been in the habit of receiving as true, hardly gain any attention unless they are from one of their own sect. The fact that Dobney is a Baptist has given his work great influence among the Baptists of this country; and the work of White would have a strong influence with many Congregationalists and Presbyterians. It ought then to be republished immediately. We propose to do it, provided we can find encouragement. One thousand copies can be published, 12mo., and put up in paper covers, we think, for about $200, so that they shall not cost exceeding 25 cents per copy. If 2000 copies are printed, the cost of the whole, in paper covers, will not probably exceed $350, or less than 25 cents per copy. In this estimate we have allowed nothing for use of type, nor counted anything for our labor in attending to the work. The type we should use is the same that we now employ in printing the Examiner, and we expect it will make about one hundred and seventy-five pages.

If the friends of truth wish to do a good work among their fellow-Christians of the denominations mentioned, as well as among others, here is a chance to employ some of their funds. Just say at once, for how many copies you will be responsible—and pay for them when the work is ready to deliver, that we may know if we shall go forward with it. We pledge ourself to take 200 copies, whether one or two thousand are printed.

If any other person can or will get up the work, in the style we propose, at a less price, we shall be glad, and will take the 200 copies we have pledged; but we wish to see it done right. If any one should wish the work bound, they will say so. The additional cost for binding will depend upon the number ordered; of that we can say more hereafter.

The copy of this work which we imported from England cost us two dollars and twenty-five cents. Let it now be reprinted in the cheap form proposed, and scatter them, if need be, gratuitously.

———o———

## SCRIPTURE EXPOSITION.

BY THE EDITOR.

[Continued from page 62.]

> Likewise, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands, that if any obey not the word, they also may without the word be won by the conversation of the wives; while they behold your chaste conversation coupled with fear.—1 PETER III. v. 1 and 2.

The apostle here proceeds with the theme of the previous chapter, viz: order, subjection, in the various relations of life; that the harmony which God has established might be manifested throughout the family, or household of Christ, and appear in all its beauty, so that God may be honored and unbelievers won over to Christ by the holy, mild, kind, and submissive spirit begotten by the gospel of the kingdom. Therefore, says Peter, "ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands"—even those who are not yet partakers with you in the salvation of Christ—"that if any obey not the word"—that disobedience of their husbands does not release them from the obligation of subjection—"they also may without the word be won"—to the hopes and privileges of the religion of Christ—"by the conversation"—*anastrophees*—mode of life, conduct, deportment—"of the wives, while they behold your chaste"—*agneen*—pure, modest, innocent, blameless—"conversation"—manner of life—"coupled with fear"—probably of offending God, which led them to watch and walk in their present mode of life. How much does that wife mistake her calling, and the entire genius of Christianity, who, from a fancied sanctity, which she supposes she possesses by her religion, instead of living

as God has directed, by the apoftle, sets herself at variance with her husband, and refufes subjection to him. She knows not what manner of spirit she is of. If her husband is an unbeliever, she will, by such a course, harden him in sin, and be justly chargeable with his ruin. Had she obeyed God in this matter, she might, by a persevering continuance in well doing, in due time, have won her husband to the Lord; or, if unsuccessful, would by such a course have attained a higher state of holiness, and hence a higher state of happiness and glory.

> Whose adorning, let it not be that outward adorning of plaiting the hair, and of wearing of gold, or of putting on of apparel; but let it be the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible, even the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price.—VERSES 3 and 4.

"Whose adorning"—*kosmos*—dress, ornament, embellishment—let it not be that outward"—*exothen*—outside, external—"of plaiting"---*emplokees*---a knotting, twisting, braiding---"the hair, and of wearing of gold, or of putting on of apparel"—*imation*---i. e. the upper garment---garments for show---for ornaments; elsewhere, called "costly array." Some think if their dress is only *plain*, as they call it, that is enough; while they wear the most expensive clothing. But, says one, "we are commanded to be in subjection to our husbands, and my husband insists upon my wearing these things." Very well—then wear them as your *cross!* But, take care you do not put them on to please and gratify yourself. If your husband will insist upon it, *obey*, and let him answer for it; in that case it is his sin, not yours. But if *you* love it, do not deceive yourself with the vain excuse that it is to please your husband. Quite likely in nineteen cases out of twenty, if the wife were to tell her husband that she really preferred modest and less costly apparel, he would not only acquiesce in it, but love her the better for it; therefore, let your adorning be 'the hidden man'—*anthropos*—metaphorically it signifies the disposition of the mind, mode of feeling, thinking, and acting—"of the heart"—*kardias*—the desires, affections, purpose of mind. As if he had said, "let your adorning be those secret dispositions, desires and affections of the new mind you have, as those begotten again, and which specially pertain to the new man, that is to be fully developed at the appearing of Jesus Christ, which consists "in that which is not corruptible;" this is that 'meek'—*praeos*—mild, gentle, kind, benevolent, humane—"and quiet spirit"—*pneumatos*—temper, disposition of mind produced by the truth and Spirit of God—"which is in the sight of God of great price" —*poluteles*—of great value, highly esteemed. Men may highly esteem you for outside adorning, but their esteem is corruptible like themselves; God will highly esteem you for the inward adorning; he is incorruptible, and will make you sharers in his incorruptibility and glory if you choose to please him rather than men; verily you will have your reward as your labor for the one or the other.

> For after this manner in the old time the holy women also, who trusted in God, adorned themselves, being in subjection unto their own husbands; even as Sara obeyed Abraham, calling him lord, whose daughters ye are as long as ye do well, and are not afraid with any amazement.—VERSES 5 and 6.

"After this manner"—that described in the previous verse—"in the old time"—formerly—"holy women also, who trusted"—*elpizousai*—who hoped, confided---"in God"---sought their happiness in conformity to the will of God, relying on him for substantial enjoyment and an incorruptible inheritance ---"adorned themselves, being in subjection" or subordination "unto their own husbands: even as Sara obeyed"—submitted to—"Abraham, calling him lord"----*kurion*----prince, ruler, master----"whose daughters ye are—*tekna*---a figure of speech, i. e. whom you *resemble* as a daughter, a mother, including the idea of moral likeness---'as long as ye do well, and are not afraid with any amazement'---that is are not affrighted with any fear, but always trusting in God in the most hopeless hour, for so did Sara and other holy women.

> Likewise, ye husbands, dwell with them according to knowledge, giving honor unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life; that your prayers be not hindered.---VERSE 7.

The obligation is not all on one side. 'Likewise, ye husbands dwell with'---live with--'them according to'---or on account of--'knowledge'---that knowledge which had been brought unto them by the gospel, of life incorruptible, and of which they had formerly been ignorant. But having received knowledge by the gospel, they were to obey that gospel and not put away their wives, as the Jews did, by reason of the hardness of their hearts, and as the heathen did who lived only for present gratification. The knowledge brought unto us makes plain God's purpose and design that men should live, or dwell, cohabit, with their wives---not put them away nor leave them, but---'giving honor unto the wife'---for, to her, i. e. to woman belongs the honor of giving birth to him by whom life and immortality are brought to light; it is 'the seed of the woman' that brings salvation to man; give her the honor that is her due, and that God has seen fit to bestow upon her in that respect; and give it to her 'as unto the weaker'---*asthenestero* ---more feeble, delicate; with the idea of more subject to injury; more frail---'vessel'---*skeuei*---instrument, utensil for containing anything---'and as being heirs together of the grace of life'---partakers of the hopes and looking for the same glorious destiny—'that your prayers be not hindered'—*ekkoptesthai*—rendered ineffectual. The mutual discharge of the various duties enjoined in the different relations of life are essential to Christian character, if these are

wilfully neglected, we pray in vain—our prayers are rendered ineffectual. The secret of so many complaints that persons do not know as their prayers are heard is here solved; they neglect duty to each other, and God will not answer them.

———o———

MISREPRESENTATION CORRECTED.—In a work issued from Boston, Mass., at No. 8 Chardon street,—prepared and published by Sylvester Bliss, Elder Apollos Hale, and others—we find ourself noticed on page 252. Speaking of persons who attended the Union Conference, in New York, in April last, they say:—

"George Storrs, who renounced Mr. Miller's views more than six years since."

Then in a note they add as follows:

"He said two years since: 'It is true that we were drawn into Mr. Miller's theory for a time, but renounced *all* his *peculiarities* more than four years ago; and some of them more than five years since; and have had *no connection* with his peculiar views for *more than four years* past; the *leaders* in that system are among our opposers.'—*Examiner, May*, 1849. Yet he was one of the leaders in this mixed company."

"The following were the 'peculiar' views of Mr. Miller, which Mr. Storrs boasts of having repudiated, and the repudiator of which is now found in the arms of Marsh, Cook & Co.:

"1. The regeneration of this earth by fire, and its restoration to its Eden beauty.

"2. The personal advent of Christ at the commencement of the millenium.

"3. His judgment of the quick and the dead at his appearing and kingdom.

"4. His reign on the earth over the nations of the redeemed.

"5. The resurrection of those who sleep in Jesus, and the change of the living saints, at the advent.

"6. The destruction of the living wicked from the earth at that event, and their confinement under chains of darkness till the second resurrection.

"7. Their resurrection and judgment, at the end of the millenium, and consignment to everlasting punishment.

"8. The bestowment of immortality, (in the scriptural, and not the secular use of this word,) through Christ, at the resurrection.

"9. The new earth the eternal residence of the redeemed.

"10. The termination of the prophetic periods about 1842.

"Neither of the above views was original with Mr. Miller; nor can one more than another of them be said to have been 'peculiar' to him; for his belief of them all (excepting the last) was equally strong. Mr. Storrs cannot say that the last of the above list was the 'peculiar' view he repudiated, for Mr. Miller always admitted that he might be mistaken in that."

This extract is proof of the fact that *the leaders* in the *peculiarities* of Mr. Miller are among our *opposers*, as we said two years ago; and we are sorry now to add that they are reckless in a degree and to an extent that must fill every honest mind with disgust, who knows the facts. If we believed their statement concerning us was the result of misapprehension, we would not speak of them as we now do; but we are forbidden to believe any such thing. It bears on the face of it the evidence of design to stigmatise us *wilfully*. Read over again what they affirm were Mr. Miller's *peculiar* views 'which Mr. Storrs *boasts* of having repudiated.' Now turn to the Bible Examiner for July, 1849, and read our own explanation of what I, '*George Storrs*,' understood to be Mr. Miller's *peculiarities*. In reference to this very statement, which Bliss, Hale and others quote from the Examiner of May previous, I there say:—

"Whatever the church or the world may understand by Millerism, *I* understand it to have *three* PECULIARITIES, and nothing more, viz: *definite time* for the advent, and that time not extending beyond A. D. 1847. That view I gave up in the winter of '44 and '45; and time has since demonstrated that I was right in so doing. The *two* other *peculiarities* of Millerism I gave up, one in the month of February, '44, and the other in June, '45. The three may be summed up thus: 1. Definite time for the advent, not to go beyond '47. 2. No return of the literal posterity of Jacob to the land wherein their fathers have dwelt. 3. The earth all to be melted at the time of the advent, and none of its inhabitants left remaining. These three points constitute the *whole* of what *I call* Millerism, or the *peculiarities* of Mr. Miller. The second personal advent of Christ—that advent pre-millenial—nigh, even at the door—the kingdom of God on earth, or the earth the inheritance of the saints—the earth to be renewed—Paradise restored, and all those *kindred* doctrines relating to the kingdom of God, are no part nor parcel of Millerism."

Such was the statement of 'George Storrs,' which was not unknown to Bliss, Hale & Co., when they made their statement concerning me. Let the reader again compare theirs with mine made in 1849; and bear in mind that Bliss and Hale had that Examiner in the office from which has just issued their statement, and see if there is any apology can be made for men occupying their public position—and with the facts before them---for making the *unchristian and ungentlemanly* charge they have against 'George Storrs.' Mark well what they say, after having stated *ten* particulars which they affirm '*Mr. Storrs boasts of having repudiated*,' they add, 'Neither of the above [*ten*] views was *original* with Mr. Miller.' So say I, *George Storrs*, except it be the 6th; and therefore not one of the others was embraced in Mr. Miller's *peculiarities* repudiated by me at the periods spoken of, nor was the 6th in the *form* they have stated; nor do I now, nor have I for the last seven years, dissented from the general view of the other nine particulars they have named. At any rate, none of them are *the* points *repudiated* at the periods named. Why do they entirely omit *two* of the particulars we did renounce and insert *nine* that we did not? Is this just? Is it honest? It certainly is not christian.

We may also add, that in the Examiner of Nov. 1847, we said: 'Mr. Miller's theory, so far as *pecu-*

*liar* to himself, has but *three* parts.' We then proceeded to state what they were; and they will be found to be the same as above quoted by us from the Examiner for July, 1849. The Examiner was sent regularly during '47 and '49 to the office where Bliss and Hale were engaged, and from whence has issued the work professing to be 'HIMES' DEFENCE.' If its statements generally are as reckless and untrue as that concerning 'George Storrs,' they are unworthy of credit.

Of the *ten* particular views which they say 'Geo. Storrs boasts of having repudiated,' we would say, briefly, the first we never renounced; but we do dissent from Mr. Miller as to *the time* of that event. On the second, we have never wavered; we believe and preach it still. The third we fully believe and preach. The fourth we believe, and on it have never wavered. The fifth we fully believe and have done so for the last eight years. From the sixth we dissent, but not without the qualifying word *all*. Mr. Miller believed that every living soul would be destroyed from the earth at *the time* of the advent, except the saints; we do not believe it; but we do believe there will be a great cutting off of wicked men; though still there will be "LEFT *of the nations*." As to the seventh we have never expressed a sentiment to the contrary. The eighth is expressed in a form to suit Jesuits. We teach immortality in the *scriptural* sense is through Christ alone, and bestowed at the resurrection. The ninth we have maintained unwaveringly; but as to the *time* the new earth will appear, that is another matter entirely. As to the tenth, we never renounced the idea that we were in the vicinity of the termination of the prophetic period, but believe that some of them may be extended to 1866–7. Mr. Miller never, to our knowledge, 'admitted that he might be mistaken' above *four* years; and the leaders in his theory of *definite time* for the second advent thus announced their view in March, 1844, in their *organ* paper. They said—

"There are none of the prophetic periods, as we understand them, extending beyond the Jewish year 1843. The above we shall *ever* maintain as the *immutable* truth of the word of God, and therefore, till our Lord comes, we shall ever look for his return as *the next event* in historical prophecy."

After the "Jewish year" 1844 passed away, one of these same leaders, supposed to be Elder Apollos Hale, but no doubt in connection with Bliss & Co., in the Advent Herald office, stretched out the periods to the "end of 1847." And among other matters, said—

"*Those who are brought to view as subjects of the wrath of God at the Second Advent, are those who reject the testimony of God on the time of that event.*" —Harmony of Prophetic Chronology, &c.

Yet now they have the audacity to change the form of expression to that found in their 10th particular; because to have stated the whole truth would have been to condemn themselves instead of 'George Storrs.'

This effort to blast our character and destroy our influence is not the first that has issued from the same quarter, which has been borne in silence; and it gives us pain to feel that duty now calls us to rebuke openly those who have sinned in this matter. We have long time holden our peace while a stream of slander has been poured over the land concerning us from men who, if their *professions* could be relied upon, are as truly the representatives of Jesus Christ as the Pope is of St. Peter. But God will yet judge between us.

One word in relation to George Storrs being "one of the leaders" in the Convention in New York last April. It is a mistake entirely. We did not even *sign* the call for that Convention. We attended it, but took no very active part in it; we declined being on any of the Committees—we took very little part in any of the discussions, and our name we believe appears not in the minutes of the Convention except a simple notice that we preached one evening We left before the Convention closed, and previous to the termination of the discussions. Truly this does not look like being *one of the leaders*—even if leaders there were.

———o———

POSTAGE.—Our friends, in ordering books, pamphlets, tracts, &c.; sent *by mail*, should remember that *we* are obliged to *pre-pay* the postage, and we cannot send any works in that way unless the amount of postage is remitted us in *addition* to the price of the works ordered; at the same time, they will see, in point of expense, it costs them no more to remit the postage to us than if they had it to pay when they receive the works. It is only the trouble and risk of sending it by mail. We prefer they should send us the money for works ordered instead of post office stamps, as some have done; yet where there is *a fraction* of a dollar to be sent they *may* send stamps for it. For the amount of postage to be *pre-paid* on any of our books, &c., see the last page of the Examiner for July. They should specially preserve that page, as we do not wish to fill our papers by republishing that matter.

In the "Truth-Seeker," No. 4, our compositor, by mistake, placed the rate of postage on the Bible Examiner *Extra* under *Bible Examiner*.

———o———

WISE MAXIMS.—The following brief maxims were adopted by the late Rev. Dr. Heugh, and if generally observed would revolutionize the whole social community; the sources of bitterness would be dried up, and peace take the place of envy and strife:

"Let me have the following maxims always in mind, for the regulation of my conduct:—*Never to praise myself; and never to speak evil of, or detract from any other individual.* Better not to speak at all, than speak to slander and calumniate. Resolve, therefore, *never to use such language of any person as I should be ashamed to use in his presence.*"

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VI. PHILADELPHIA, SEPTEMBER, 1851. NO. 9.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,

At 68 North Eighth Street, between Arch and Cherry,

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, $1; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; always in advance.

## CHRIST'S DEATH AND RESURRECTION.

BY THOMAS READ, NEW YORK.

[Continued from page 119.]

Tho prophecy concerning Christ in the 16th psalm requires a thorough exposition.

Verse 8: "I have set the Lord always before me; because he is at my right hand. I shall not be moved. Therefore my heart is glad, and my glory rejoiceth. *My flesh also shall rest in hope. For thou wilt not leave my soul in sheol, (the state of death,) neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption.* Thou wilt show me the path of life; in thy presence there is fullness of joy; at thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore." Here is Peter's comment translated from Griesbach:

Acts 2: 22, "Men of Israel hear these words: Jesus the Nazarene, a man from God, marked out among you by mighty works, and wonders, and signs, which God worked through him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know; HIM, being delivered up by the fixed counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands nailed up and *slain.* And *God hath raised him up*, having *loosed* the pains of *death*, because it was not possible that he should be held by it. For David saith *of him*, I foresaw the Lord always before my face; for he is on my right hand, that I may not be moved; therefore my heart rejoiced, and my tongue was glad, and moreover, *my flesh will dwell in hope;* because *thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, nor suffer thy* HOLY ONE *to see corruption.* Thou hast made known to me the ways of life; thou wilt make me full of joy with thy countenance. Men and brethren, let me speak with freedom to you of the patriarch David, for HE is *both dead and buried*, and *his tomb* is with us unto this day. Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn to him with an oath, that of the fruit of his loins there should *one sit upon* HIS *throne*, he by foresight spake of the *resurrection of Christ*, that HE was not LEFT *in hell*, nor did *his flesh see corruption.* THIS JESUS *hath God raised up*, whereof we are all witnesses. Therefore being exalted to the right hand of God, and having received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath poured out the same, which ye see and hear. For David is NOT gone up to heaven; but he himself saith, The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand, UNTIL I make thine enemies a footstool for thy feet. Therefore let all the house of Israel assuredly know, that God hath made THIS JESUS, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ."

Now attend to Paul's commentary from Griesbach: Acts 13: 26, "Men and brethren, children of the stock of Abraham, and whoever among you *fear God, to you* is the word of this salvation sent. For they that dwell in Jerusalem, and their rulers, not knowing *him*, and condemning *him*, have fulfilled the voices of the prophets, which are read every sabbath. And finding no cause of *death*, they desired Pilate that he should *be slain.* And when they had fulfilled all that was written of *him*, they took *him* down from the tree, and laid HIM in a tomb. But God raised HIM from the dead. And HE *was seen* many days by those that came up with *him* from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are now his witnesses unto the people. And we declare unto you good tidings, the promise which was made to the fathers; that God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in raising up Jesus; as it is also written in the first psalm: Thou art my son; THIS DAY have I begotten thee. And that he raised him from the dead, *no more* to return to corruption, he thus said, I will give unto you the *sure* mercies of David. Wherefore he saith also in another psalm, Thou wilt not suffer thine Holy One to see corruption. For David, after he had in his own generation served the will of God, rested, and was laid with his fathers, and SAW CORRUPTION. But he whom God raised saw no corruption. Be it known unto you, therefore, men and brethren, that through HIM is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins, and by him every one that believeth is justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses. *Beware* therefore lest that come upon you, which is spoken of in the prophets; Behold, ye despisers, and wonder, and hide yourselves; for I work a work in your days, a work which ye will not believe, though one explain it unto you."

Before remarking upon these important scriptures, we refer our readers to the definition of the Hebrew word *sheol*, translated into Greek by the word *hades*, which words mean primarily the grave, but generally the state of death. We first cull out those two important lines that are so often repeated: "For thou wilt not leave my soul in *sheol*, neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption."

This is one of those beautiful parallelisms that so frequently occur in the holy scriptures, the last line being a perfect echo of the sentiments of the former, and both lines expressing the same thing in different language. To exhibit the more plainly the similarity of meaning in two parts, Dr. Eadie, in his Biblical Cyclopedia, translates thus: "For thou wilt not abandon ME to sheol,

"Nor permit thy Holy One to see corruption."

The words "my soul" are merely an emphatic mode to express myself, and each line most clearly represents the entire cessation of the life of Christ. The first line, "For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell," Peter explains as referring to the resurrection of Christ, that "HE was not left in hell." This is the true translation and is justified by Dr. Clark. If Christ had not been raised from death, his soul would have been left in the grave, in a state of death; yea, *his soul* would have seen corruption. As both these lines express exactly the same thing; to have

left the soul of Christ in the grave was to suffer *it* to see corruption; and to suffer the Holy One, the identical Christ, to see corruption, was to leave the soul of Christ in the grave, in the state of death. A similar form of expression occurs in Psalm 30: 3, "O Lord, thou hast brought up *my soul* from the *grave;* thou hast kept *me alive*, that I should not go down to the pit." And, "Let *my soul die* the death of the righteous." "Let *my soul die* with the Philistines." And in more than one hundred other places, as a concordance will show.

"Thou wilt show to me the path of life." The way to everlasting life is by a resurrection with an incorruptible body; therefore he says, God will not suffer his Holy One to see corruption; and by rising from the dead with an incorruptible body, Christ, "who has destroyed death, and hath illustrated life and incorruptibility." 2 Tim. 1: 10. Paul's remark, Acts 13: 34, "Now no more to return to corruption," is equal to saying that *Christ was mortal* till his resurrection, but now he has an immortal body.

The careful and candid reader will readily perceive that the unity of person, both of David and of Christ, is consistently maintained by all the three speakers. That David, his soul, and his body, are one person; and that Christ, his soul, his body, and the Holy One, constitute but one person, and all these singly represent the Christ. The living and the dead body, and the living and the dead soul, are equally liable to corruption, and the pronouns denoting identity are applied promiscuously and interchangeably to all. If the soul of Christ had been left in sheol, Christ himself would have been left there; and there would be no living Christ, nor living soul of Christ in existence. His soul was not left in hell; *he* was not left in hell; the holy One saw no corruption; *he* saw no corruption. There is no difference in the meaning of these four expressions. "David has not ascended into the heavens." Why? Because David is in the tomb corrupted. Jesus was "both dead and buried;" but as HE has not seen corruption, he has risen. Jesus is alive. Why? Because he has "shown himself alive by many infallible proofs" to many witnesses. Necessary inference.—If Jesus had not shown himself in a visible and tangible manner, there would have been no proof that Jesus, or the soul of Jesus was alive. Because "David himself saw corruption," he cannot have "ascended into the heavens." David is therefore yet in the tomb; and if dust and corruption are conscious, so may David be; but not without.

But we will more closely follow the arguments of both the Apostles. They assert that David could not have spoken these words of himself, for he was both dead and buried, and therefore the soul of David, or David himself, had seen corruption, of the truth of which fact, the men of Israel might easily be convinced by examining the "tomb of the kings," where they would find *David in a state of corruption;* and hence neither David, nor the soul of David, which they regarded as one, could by any possibility have "ascended into the heavens," because he was dead in the tomb. It is evident therefore that David spake not these words of himself; but of some other person. And as God had sworn that he would *raise up* Christ to sit upon *his* (David's) throne, which was "to endure to all generations;" and as Christ must be incorruptible to sit upon an everlasting throne, and as Christ must have a mortal and corruptible nature to be subject to death for our sins, therefore while in this nature, he could not inherit his everlasting throne, for these reasons David must have spoken these words of the "*resurrection of Christ;*" "that his soul was not left in hell, nor did he see corruption." And we testify that God hath raised Christ from the dead, "now no more to return to corruption;" for his corruptible nature has put on incorruption.

We moreover testify that God has fulfilled the promise made unto the fathers, 'in raising up Jesus,' *not yet* indeed to sit upon the throne of his Father David, which is now thrown down; but he is exalted to his Father's throne *until* his enemies, that "would not that he should reign over them," shall be made his footstool. For of the last incumbent of David's throne, Ezekiel says, 21: 25, "Thou profane, wicked prince of Israel, whose day is come, when iniquity shall have an end, thus saith the Lord God, *Remove the diadem*, and take off the crown; this shall not be the same; exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high. I will overturn, overturn, overturn it; and it shall be no more, UNTIL *he* come whose right it is; and I will give it him." When Christ comes again, he will reign upon his own throne, the throne of his father David, for ever and ever. "To him that overcometh will I give to set with me on *my* throne, even as I also overcame, and am (NOW) setd own with my Father in *his* throne." Rev. 3: 21.

And we furthermore declare that David prophesied of the resurrection of Christ in these words: "Thou art my Son, *this day* have I begotten thee." While Christ was in the tomb, God had no living Son, no living Christ, in existence. But *this day*, the day of his resurrection, God begat him from the dead and declared him to be the Son of God with power. Rom. 1: 4. And he has now become the *first born*, with an incorruptible body, "of many brethren."

Both the apostles have taken especial pains to convince us of certain facts. 1. That David, soul and body, is truly dead; but they refer to this as a clearly demonstrated fact, not merely to convince us of this, which, in these days, there was none to dispute; but to convince us that David spake of Christ. 2. That God had fulfilled these prophesies in raising up Christ. These were the facts that caused the conversion of "about three thousand souls."

If David, or the soul of David, was alive and conscious; or if Christ, or the soul of Christ was alive and conscious, while his body remained in the tomb; then the arguments of the apostles are completely overturned. Their argument is, as David is not yet raised, he remains in the tomb, and therefore could not have ascended into heaven; but as Christ has been raised, the prophecy has been fulfilled that spake of his exaltation to the right hand of his Father. There would have been an entire end of the very being of Christ, if he were not raised, and there will be an entire end of David; yea, he has utterly perished, if he is not raised again from the dead. The apostles argue that if there should be *no resurrection*, there would be *no future life* after death, which is the doctrine of these pages.

And this *same argument* Paul uses with the Corinthians, in his reasoning upon the death and resurrection of Christ. We give the best translation of his reasoning we can find, which the reader can compare with the King's translation, or with the original. 1 Cor. 15: 1.

1 Cor. 15. (1.) I publish again the joyful news which I once proclaimed among you, my Christian brethren, which you then received with transport, and in the firm belief of which you now continue. (2.) By your reception of which you are *put into a state of salvation*, if you are tenacious of the animating doctrine I delivered to you—unless, indeed, as some would insinuate, your belief of these truths

is absurd and visionary. (3.) Among the first and fundamental truths, then, which I published among you, and of which I was convinced myself upon the best evidence, were the following: That, agreeably to the *predictions of the prophets*, the *Messiah suffered death*, to rescue us from our vices. (4.) That *he* was deposited in a tomb, and that *he was raised from it* on the third day, agreeably to the scripture predictions. (5.) That after his resurrection, he was seen by Peter, then by the twelve apostles. (8.) And last of all, as to an untimely abortive birth, he exhibited himself to me. (12.) Now, since we all unanimously agree in proclaiming to the world the resurrection of Christ, what foundation have certain persons among you for asserting that the resurrection of dead persons is an absurd impossibility? (13.) For IF the resurrection of dead persons is a thing absolutely impossible, it will follow that *Christ was never raised from the grave.* (14.) Consequently, if Christ was never actually raised from the grave, our preaching the Christian religion is absurd, and your belief of it is absurd. (15.) And the result is, that we all of us have been publicly attesting a pious falsehood, when in the most solemn manner we declare to the world that God raised Christ from the dead; a fact, however, that never happened; if it be true that the resurrection of dead men is, in the nature of things, absolutely an absurd impossibility. (16.) For if the resurrection of dead persons is an absurdity, it will follow that Christ was never raised at all. (17.) Consequently, *Christ was never actually reanimated, your belief of Christianity is absurd and fruitless,* and the weight of all your former crimes again devolves upon you. (18.) And it will follow also, that these Christians, who have *died* in the belief of their principles, *are totally lost out of creation.* (19.) If all the hopes Christianity really taught us to entertain, *were circumscribed within the narrow circle of this vain life,* we Christians are the most wretched of all mankind! (20.) But Christ was actually raised from the tomb, and has become the FIRST FRUITS of a glorious harvest of the *sleeping dead.* (21.) For since by one man, *death* was introduced, so by another man was introduced a *resurrection from death.* (22.) For as by Adam, all the human race were subjected to MORTALITY, so by Christ Jesus shall all the *pious dead* be entitled to IMMORTALITY. (23.) But every one in this restitution is raised in a regular gradation, Christ was the *first* that rose from death to immortality; and the next will be the virtuous Christians at his glorious advent. (26.) The last foe he shall dethrone and annihilate is death. (29.) Otherwise, if when we sleep in death, we are never to be reanimated, how forlorn must be their hope, who were baptized in the firm assurance of a glorious resurrection from the dead! and upon these principles, why are persons baptized at all into the belief of the future restoration of the dead saints to life and incorruptibility? (30.) And upon this scheme, how absurd is it also for us to expose ourselves to dangers every hour! (31.) I solemnly declare, and can pledge all my glorious hopes in our Lord Jesus Christ, upon the truth of my declaration, that I am daily in the jaws of death. (32.) Since, humanly speaking, I fought with brute creatures at Ephesus; what extreme folly was I guilty of to encounter this danger, IF the resurrection of the saints to immortality be a fable! *If* indeed the dead do not rise again, let us traverse a circle of every sensual pleasure to-day, for to-morrow will put an entire period to all our joys.

If Paul does not predicate the present life of Christ and the future life of believers entirely upon the resurrection of the dead, then there is no meaning in language. Paul's argument is utterly incompatible with anything like consciousness in death, or in an intermediate state. If the dead, or the souls of the dead, are in any degree conscious, then his arguments are not true. But he speaks of the dead as being truly dead, and argues, if there be no resurrection, they have perished, and there is a complete extinction of their being.

As the translation here given is fuller than in the king's version, there may be some words that do not find an exact counterpart in the original, yet we think the sense is fairly given, excepting perhaps in the 22d verse, which although it expresses a glorious truth, it may not be that truth that was intended to be taught in this place. And it is quite as likely that it may have been obscured by transcribers and commentators, to save their creeds; because, standing as it does here, it strikes a death blow to inherent immortality, and fully establishes the truth advocated in these pages. The address to the christian brethren, the pronouns, we and you, and the whole scope of the argument seems confined to the resurrection of Christ, and the resurrection of the saints, to the exclusion, in this chapter, of any notice of the retribution of the wicked. But if any prefer the King's version, which makes this verse only teach the resurrection of all men, and not the resurrection of the righteous to immortality, we can well spare a disputed text, seeing our arguments are founded upon hundreds of plain texts that none can gainsay; and indeed we might safely rest the whole argument upon a proper exposition of the 18th or 32d verse, either of which fully establishes our position. But as the lovers of the truths of the Bible, those who would learn of the Master only, are generally in the minority; they need assurance to be made doubly sure, and for their sakes, we shall add line upon line of argument, that they may stand firm who have taken refuge in the teachings of Christ, and have strong consolation, and a well-grounded hope of scripture immortality; while so many, by their tenacious attachment to the traditions of men contained in their conflicting creeds, are darkening the veil that obscures their perception of the glorious truths of the gospel.

That Christ truly died, and that God as truly raised him, not from a state of partial death, that did not extend to the entire Christ; but from a state of complete cessation of conscious being; and that through him as a risen Saviour, man may obtain the forgiveness of his sins, and a resurrection from the dead, with an incorruptible and therefore an immortal body, are the fundamental truths upon which Christianity is based. Take away these and the whole superstructure crumbles into dust. For however great may be the promises of God, respecting the glory to be revealed—as without these man can have no future existence—he cannot possibly enjoy them! But those who believe in the natural immortality of the soul, and that the resurrection has reference only to the body, and not to the soul or person, certainly do not believe the above fundamental truths of the gospel! Will the reader lay this to heart.

Thus the manner of the death of Christ, the great sacrifice for the sin of the world, like every great doctrine of Christianity, conspires to prove the MORTALITY of the WHOLE MAN.

———o———

TRACTS.—We intend to add several to our list soon. Among them Bishop Newton on Endless Torments. Shall we be helped in the work? It is no time to sleep.

## IS MAN IMMORTAL?

BY J. B. FRISBIE.

*Bro. Storrs:*—The following is the substance of an article just returned by Mr. Sanford to me. Mr. S. is an Universalist editor. He and myself have been discussing the immortality question for some time past, and the excuse for returning this article is, that the editor is away from home:

I. I will now call your attention to the creation, death and resurrection of man, with answers to your objections:

"And God said, let us make man in our image, after our likeness. And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." Gen. 1: 26; 2: 7, and Job 33: 4.

1. I would have you to observe that it was man which was made in the image of God, and that was formed of the material dust of the ground. It was not his soul or spirit, nor his breath that was the image, but *man*.

2. If the breath of life was the immortality, then every beast, fowl and creeping thing has it. "And all flesh died that moved upon the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of beasts, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man; all in whose nostrils was the breath of life." Gen. 7: 21, 22. They have all one breath. Eccl. 3: 19.

3. We understand it was man who became a living soul, and not the breath of life So, when man is alive, he is a living soul, and when dead he is a *dead soul.* Num. 9: 6, and 6: 6. Original. If a living soul is immortality in man, then beasts, &c., have it. And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth wherein there is a living soul. Gen. 1: 30. Margin. And every living soul died in the sea. Rev. 16: 3. The sea cannot drown an immortal soul. Howbeit, that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural. The first man is of the earth, earthy. 1 Cor. 15: 46–47. Thus in vain we search for immortality in man's creation, but the reverse. Gen. 3: 22.

II. By the disobedienee of Adam came literal death upon all. And the Lord God commanded the man saying, in the day thou eatest thereof, dying thou shalt die. Gen. 2: 16–17. We follow the marginal reading in this, believing it most correct. We understand in that very day the law in Adam's nature was changed; so he commenced that day dying and he did die. All the days that Adam lived were 930 years, and he died. Gen. 5: 5. Therefore we die daily and continually.

It is an admitted fact that the infant pulse beats about 130. In manhood about 70. When in old age only about 50 pulsations in a minute. Carpenter's Physiology, page 493. So dying we shall die; and this dying nature we have all inherited from Adam; so death passed upon *all men*, for that all have sinned (in Adam.) Rom. 5: 12; 1 Cor. 15: 22. The penalty of this law could not have been spiritual death, for that would make the transgression the punishment. Not only so, but it would be to contradict the sentence of the great Judge of all. Hear him tell *what* death it was: And unto Adam he said, because thou hast eaten of the tree of which I *commanded* thee, saying, thou shalt not eat of it. In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken; *for dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return.* Gen. 3: 17–19. This is *one* literal death, and not two, the *only* death passed at that time upon Adam. Rom. 5: 12; 1 Cor. 15: 21; Heb. 9: 27. When he gather unto himself his Spirit and his breath, man shall turn again unto dust. Job 34: 14–15, His sons come to honor, and he *knoweth it not.* Job 14: 10–22. Man's breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his *thoughts perish.* Ps. 146: 4; 104: 22; Isa. 63: 16. For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth the beasts—they have all one breath or spirit—all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again. Eccl. 3: 19–20. The dead know not anything—also, their love, and their hatred, and their energy is now perished. Eccl. 9: 5–6. Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the spirit or breath shall return unto God who gave it. Eccl. 12: 7. If man has a spirit that leaves him at death, it has neither thoughts, love, hatred, envy or knowledge, for all perish in death, unless it is contended these belong to the body of man, and not to his spirit, which would be to give up the question of an intelligent spirit.

III. There are a few, at the first thought, seeming objections to the view that man's soul and spirit sleep in death.

1. The spirit (or breath) shall return to God who gave it. God giveth to all life and breath, and all things. Acts 17: 25. This can be no objection, when it is understood that spirit is breath.

2. Now that the *dead are raised*—for all live unto him. Luke 20: 37–38. Now they all live unto him in the same sense that they are raised. God, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not, as though they were. Rom. 4: 17. Or as Mark 12: 23–25, in the resurrection, when they shall rise. For when they shall rise, &c. Now these were dead and were not yet raised. Therefore this can form no objection to our belief.

3. Lord, remember me, *when* thou comest into thy kingdom. Verily I say unto thee, to-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise. Jesus said to Mary three days afterwards, Touch me not; for I am *not* yet *ascended* to my Father. John 20: 17. Bear in mind the thief's request and his Lord's answer, and place the comma after to-day, and every difficulty will vanish at once. Some say it was his soul, but that wants proof.

4. Stephen said, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit, and he fell asleep. We understand Stephen to request Jesus to receive his spirit or life with the expectation that when Christ, who is his life, shall appear, then shall he also appear with him in glory. Col. 3: 4. Some, to misrepresent and make a burlesque of our views, try to make us say, Lord Jesus, receive my air or wind. But this idea is not more ridiculous than the supposition that a man is both dead and alive at the same time.

5. For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house, which is *from* heaven, that mortality might be swallowed up of life—absent from the (mortal) body, present with the Lord, when mortality is swallowed up of life, at the judgment. 2 Cor. 15: 1–10. When the dead shall be raised, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then death is swallowed up in victory. 1 Cor. 15: 52, 54, the same.

6. Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether it be by life, or by death. For to me life is (to magnify) Christ, and to die is gain (to Christ's cause.) What I shall choose I know not, for I am in a strait between two, having an earnest desire to the return,

and to be with Christ, which is far better than to live or die. In this I have followed the literal rendering of the Greek. Phil. 1: 20, 23. See the parable in Luke 12: 36, referred to in a Greek Polyglot, where the same word is translated *return*. With this agrees Phil. 3: 11, 20, 21. In order that by any means I may attain to the resurrection from among the dead. New translation. For our conversation is in heaven, from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile bodies, &c. If the old translation is right, it makes Paul contradict himself in this epistle, viz: if it is understood that Paul is in heaven with Christ, and on earth looking for him. Thus we find by a close examination of scripture that for the disobedience of Adam, his whole posterity are levelled even with the dust, and there is not a doubt on our part but this would have been their end if Christ, the second Adam, the Lord from heaven, had not come into our world and suffered the penalty of the law of the first Adam, which was literal death of the whole man; not to redeem from dying, but to give a resurrection. 1 Cor. 15: 17, 18, 32; Ps. 49: 12. Now unless a man is wofully blinded by the mist of human invention, it appears that he must see the great necessity of Christ's death.

IV. By the obedience of Christ, there is to be a resurrection of the dead. Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I may take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father. John 10: 17, 18; and 15: 10. Christ became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Phil. 2: 8; Luke 24: 26; Rom. 5: 14, 21. Disobedience and obedience. For since by man (Adam) came death, by man (Christ Jesus) came also the resurrection of the dead. 1 Cor. 15: 21; 2 Tim. 1: 10. And so it is written, the first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening (or life-giving) spirit. 1 Cor. 15: 45. The son quickeneth whom he will. John 5: 21. He that eateth me, even he shall live by me. John 6: 57.

V. Immortality, viz: Eternal Life only in Christ, to be given in the resurrection to those who seek for it.

1. Lord of Lords, who only hath immortality. 1 Tim. 6: 16. This contrast is not between man in his resurrected immortal state, nor angels who cannot die, but between the immortal God and mortal man. Rom. 1: 23. Original. O Lord, thou art our God; let not mortal man prevail against thee. 2 Chron. 14: 11. Margin. Shall mortal man be more just than God? Job 4: 17. I find that mortal man is contrasted with the immortal God; but nowhere in the Bible do I find man called immortal, either soul or body.

2. Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, (in the resurrection,) and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel. 2 Tim. 1: 10. In him was life, and the life was the light of men. John 1: 4. Since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. 1 Cor. 15: 21. Christ hath abolished the death brought on us by Adam, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel in the resurrection of the dead.

3. God, who will render to every man according to his deeds. To them who by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory, and honor, and immortality, eternal life. Rom. 2: 6, 7. Good Master, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life? If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments. Mat. 19: 16, 17. Labor for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life. Job. 6: 27. Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life. 1 Tim. 6: 12. In this we understand the Apostle to say immortality is eternal life.

4. The question is asked, how can he put on immortality at the resurrection of the body, if he has none?

Ans. This is the record that God hath given to us eternal life; and this life (or immortality) is in his Son. 1 John 5: 11. When Christ, who is our life, (immortality,) shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory. Col. 3: 4. Every one which believeth on him may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day. John 6: 40. With this agrees, I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day. Jesus said unto her, I am the resurrection and the life. John 11: 24, 25. I understand Jesus to say that he is the life of the resurrection. If so, it cannot be an immortal spirit of our own in no way. The last Adam was made a quickening spirit—the dead shall be raised incorruptible—and this mortal shall put on immortality. But thanks be to God who giveth us the victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ. 1 Cor. 15: 45, 52, 54, 57. If this plain, positive proof fails to convince from what source we shall have immortality, then God's word must fail to convince any man of error. But still we have more. But the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord. Rom. 6: 23. If eternal life is the gift of God through Christ, then most certainly we were never born with it. But if the Spirit of Him (God) that raised up Jesus from the dead—shall also quicken (or make alive) your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you. Rom. 8: 11. Now is it not a fair conclusion if this refers to Christ's resurrection, it does also to ours. And if it is the Spirit of God that is the life of the resurrection through Christ, where then is this immortal soul of our own to come from? From the Pagans? Jesus says, I live by the Father; and we are to live by Christ. Joh. 6: 57.

5. One item more—some make the eternal life now present. As being the spiritual life of the Christian here. Let us see. He that hath the Son, hath life. 1 John 5: 12. Now just as we have the Son, so we have life. Well, how do we have the Son? Let Paul answer. That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith. Eph. 3: 17. Again, Christ in you the hope of glory. Col. 1: 27. Once more—He that believeth on the Son, hath everlasting life. John 3: 36. How? In belief. This is life eternal that they might know the only true God and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent. John 17: 3. How do we *have* and *know* Jesus Christ his Son? By faith, in hope. This is all the knowledge we can have now. Therefore we have immortality, eternal life by *faith* and *hope*. Amen.

*Sylvan*, Mich., 1851.

## STATE OF THE DEAD.

### "ADDITIONAL REMARKS."

BY REV. WM. GLEN MONCRIEFF, SCOTLAND.

I. Eccles. iii. 21.—"Who knoweth the spirit of a man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast (of cattle) that goeth downward to the earth?" This is a text commonly supposed to favor the idea of a quickening and rational spirit in man, capable of surviving, in consciousness, the dissolution of the organic frame. We have spent hours in endeavoring to understand the meaning of this text, and must confess that the longer we have examined it, we find the less ground for the common notion. Let the

reader take the following remarks into consideration:—

1. Solomon does not say this spirit (ruach) in man goeth upward at *death*, in contrast with the spirit (ruach) of cattle going downwards at death.

2. Even suppose Solomon does mean that man's spirit goeth upward at death, he does not assert that it continues to think after disembodiment. We must, therefore, consult other scriptures for information as to man's after-death state, and David says most unqualifiedly, "His breath (his spirit—*ruch*, a form of *ruach*,) goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." Ps. 146: 4.

3. In the verses immediately preceding the one before us, we read: 18. "I said in mine heart concerning the estate of the sons of men, that God might manifest them, and that they might see that they themselves are beasts. 19. For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them: as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath (ruach;) so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast: for all is vanity. 20. All go unto one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again. 21. The word (ruach) rendered breath in verse 19, 'they have all one breath,' is the same word rendered 'spirit' in the 21st, when the writer is speaking of men and cattle, and there appears to be no reason why our translators should not have rendered the same word, which occurs twice in the 21st verse, by the same English word 'breath,' as they did in verse 19. Solomon says, men and cattle have one breath, and about that breath, common to both, he points out some distinction in verse 21, by saying that of man goes upward, or, as it is in the margin, is ascending, but he does not tell us when; and that of the cattle, which goes downward, but he does not tell us when; and concerning the breath of man which goeth upward, or is ascending, he says, who knoweth it? and he expresses the same ignorance concerning the breath of cattle that descends to the ground. Now comes the question, what does this ascending of the one and descending of the other most likely refer to? We suggest that he describes something that takes place during *the life* of men and of cattle, and not after death; and that the whole matter is simply this—man's breath, in consequence of his erect position, goes upward from his nostrils toward the sky, while that of the cattle, in consequence of the drooping of their heads, is, in out-breathing, sent from their nostrils downwards toward the ground. This fact is quite apparent, especially in a frosty morning, and few have failed to observe it, as well as Solomon. Now regarding this breath common to men and cattle, but differently exhaled in consequence of their different formation, the observer, Solomon, expresses the then existing ignorance. Who knoweth the breath of the one and the breath of the other, or who knows what this breath common to all is? Modern chemistry has told us what this breath is composed of, both when it enters and leaves the lungs, but no chemistry, no research of science, will ever likely explain how the atmosphere, by entering the lungs, does sustain a soul in living being.

Does not this interpretation much better harmonize with the humble view given in this chapter, of man as he is, than that one which sees an immense line of distinction between men and cattle, in the mere fact that, at sometime, the breath or spirit of the one ascends, and that of the other goes towards the earth?

II. Neither can any information as to the after-death state of man be drawn from the text, "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit (ruach) shall return unto God who gave it." Eccl. 12: 7. Even suppose we take the common idea about man's spirit, which Solomon says returns to God at death, it becomes us to inquire what does the Bible say about its condition then? Here Solomon makes no affirmation that it continues still to think, and the Psalmist, as already stated, asserts that, at the very day of man's death, "his thoughts perish." Ps. 146: 4. If the spirit of man, as many hold, must think after death in going again to God, did it think in coming from him to enter man's body, which it leaves at the hour of death? Did any person ever tell us those thoughts which it must have had before embodiment?

Let it be noticed that, immediately after stating that, at death, the spirit "returns to God who gave it," the writer exclaims, "vanity of vanities, all is vanity!" Verse 8. Is it reasonable to suppose, for a moment, that, if Solomon had believed that the spirit, on leaving the body, gathered immense information, yea, even continued in consciousness, he would have uttered such an exclamation? I cannot think he would. On the supposition that all was over for the time, that the man was, as Job says, as if he had never been, that his thoughts had utterly perished, the exclamation is most natural and instructive. We have no doubt that there is here an allusion to the creation of man, when God breathed into him the breath of life and man became living soul. Having this in his view, Solomon most naturally represents man's spirit (ruach) or breath as returning at death to the Creator from whom it came. And though it is not said, might not the same thing have been affirmed as correctly of the beasts, and of all other living souls? Does not their breath when they die, return to God? Did He not give them their breath at first as surely as he gave it to man? The only difference between the mode of their creation seems to have been this, they were at once summoned into being as living souls; whereas the soul of man, or the soul man, was formed perfectly first, and, after remaining a little while unliving, the Creator animated him by breathing into his nostrils the breath of life. Gen. 2: 7.

III. A difficulty may be found with regard to the sleep of the dead, in the fact that Moses was present with Elijah at our Lord's transfiguration. Now no difficulty ought to be overlooked in arriving at a scriptural view of the condition af the expired; still, we think, the difficulty here may be more in appearance than in reality. May not Moses have been raised from the dead sometime previous to the transfiguration? We suggest further, that when the Bible teaches the unconsciousness of the dead, by direct affirmations such as these, "the dead know not anything," and that, at the hour of dissolution, the "thoughts perish," &c.; there is no alternative but to regard the presence of Moses on the mount as a Divine declaration to us that he had been resurrected.

IV. On the supposition of the sleep of the dead, the revelations as to a final judgment become more intelligible and consistent; nay, there is reason to to conclude that not a little of the incomprehensibility, and that all of the apparent inconsistency, in the announcements about the awful world-assize, have been occasioned by a departure from what seems to be the inspired teaching about the dead as unconscious. Were good men to depart to heaven and bad men to hell at death, as is popularly believed, it is difficult to understand what would be the use of a judgment day, such as is very often

mentioned in the Bible—a day when all are to appear for trial. It surely is not in harmony with the ordinary perceptions of what is wise and just, first to remove men to heaven and afterwards determine by public judgment if they ought to have been there; and first to send men to perdition and afterward sit in judgment to determine if they ought to have been consigned to that region. There must be trial first and then reward or punishment: the Bible speaks of the trial—the universal judgment-day, however, as still future. "God hath appointed a day, in which he will judge THE WORLD in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained," &c. Acts 17: 31. "We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ: that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad. 2 Cor. 5: 10. From Heb. 9: 27, we learn that the judgment is after death. "It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment:" but, at what period it takes place posterior to death, whether immediately or at some time after dissolution, the passage does not inform us. On this point we are, however, fully instructed in 2 Tim. 4: 1, "I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead, at HIS APPEARING and his kingdom." Consider, also, Rev. 20: 12, 13.

V. Two passages in the Revelations have sometimes been employed to support the popular notion regarding the consciousness of the dead: they are these—1st, Chap. 6: 9, 11, "And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God," &c.; "And they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord," &c.; "And white robes were given unto every one of them," &c.; 2d, chap. 20: 4, "And I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus * * * and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years."

1. The reader will be kind enough to remark, that these two passages are drawn from one of the most highly figurative books in the Bible: a book of such a nature that it would be contrary to all the rules of sound interpretation were one to attempt to establish any doctrine or article of faith, like the common opinion about the state of the dead, by quotations from its pages; and, more especially, to establish a doctrine which, like the common notion referred to, is apparently denied in other and plainer portions of the divine word, as has already been shown in this treatise.

2. The phrase "the souls of them," in both passages is simply a Hebrew idiom expressing the men themselves, one common through the whole scriptures, and frequently illustrated in this work. For a moment suppose the three words "the souls of" removed from both passages, and the idea of John is left as perfect as when they are retained. In the first passage he says, "I saw under the altar them that were slain;" that is, he beheld in his vision of futurity a number of saints who had been slaughtered for the truth. He saw them under "the altar," not a representation of any altar in heaven, we apprehend, but under the Altar of burnt-offering in the Jewish Temple, to intimate that their death was a sacrifice well received, and acceptable in the sight of God. In the second passage he testifies, "I saw them that were beheaded," &c. In accordance with this view we read in the second passage that "they" "the souls of them," that is, the men themselves, became alive, they "LIVED and reigned with Christ," &c.

3. But the slain souls, or the dead men spoken of in the first quotation, are represented as saying "How long, O Lord," &c.; and as having "white robes given unto every one of them," &c. What are we to make of this? The imagery is bold, but similar language about dead men is discovered in other parts of the Bible. For example, Gen. 4: 10, "The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground." When blood can be spoken of as crying, is it to be wondered at that slain souls should be represented as uttering exclamations? In Isaiah, chap. 14, we find the mighty dead in Sheol, where there is "no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom," exhibited as stirred up, (verse 9,) to address "the King of Babylon," (verse 4,) whose "pomp was brought down to the grave," and over whom the worm was spread, (verse 11,) in the most humiliating and withering language, "Art thou become weak as we, art thou become like unto us?" verse 10. If the reader will take the trouble to peruse the chapter from verse 9 to verse 20, we feel considerable assurance that the apparent difficulty, found in the verses from the Revelation depicting dead souls as speaking, will speedily vanish from his mind.

VI. A few remarks may perhaps be required on the verses at the commencement of the 12th chapter of 2 Cor. "I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord. I knew a man in Christ about fourteen years ago, (whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth;) such an one caught up to the third heaven. And I knew such a man, (whether in the body, or out of the body I cannot tell: God knoweth;) how that he was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it was not lawful (margin, possible) for a man to utter." We solicit attention to the following thoughts.

1. It will be observed that the apostle is speaking of visions and revelations," verses 1 and 7, so that there is no absolute necessity for supposing they were realities he saw and heard on this occasion. John in his vision saw heaven opened, and heard sounds like the voice of mighty waters, but he saw heaven opened and listened to the sounds when he was "in the spirit;" they were not realities he beheld, for even some of the agents who performed some of the parts, and uttered the exclamations and groans, or anthems, were not yet in existence.

2. Though there is no absolute need for supposing that what Paul saw and heard were realities, but merely representations of them, the account of his revelations here given has such an air of reality about it, that any explanation which would admit reality seems to be most suited to the whole spirit and impression of the record. It seems to have been the third, or highest heaven, that he actually saw, and words spoken there that he actually heard. He was in some way caught up, or, more literally, carried away, and witnessed realities.

3. Be it also noted that Paul was uncertain as to the mode in which he was "caught up;" he says it was one of two ways, but in which of them God only knew. He seems to express, however, a certainty that he was caught up, and beheld realities.

4. The first of the two ways is this—"in the body." By being caught up in the body he appears to understand a temporary personal translation to the scene of the revelations he obtained. Philip was by the Spirit miraculously "caught away" from the presence of the Eunuch, and there seems to be no reason to believe that he could not as easily have been wafted to paradise as to Azotus. Acts 8: 40. In this way Paul seems to suppose it possible he was exalted to the third heavens, and witnessed its reali-

ties with his eyes, and heard its language with his ears. So far all is plain.

5. The other supposition is thus expressed, "or whether out of the body." The Greek (ektos) here translated "out of" is, in 1 Cor. 6: 18, rendered "without"—Flee fornication. Every sin that a man doeth is without (ektos) the body; but he that commits fornication sinneth against his body." When Paul here speaks of "every sin," he must be understood, as Barnes remarks, to be referring to sins in general; in other words, the apostle is here instituting a comparison between sins in general and the particular sin, "fornication," about which he is expostulating with the Corinthians. And whatever be the meaning of sin "without the body," it must be obvious it does not mean sin committed by a man when disembodied. Let the reader reflect on the multitude of sins that are done mentally, that is, in thought, desire, and purpose; let him also reflect on its enfeebling and life-destroying tendency, about which the apostle is discoursing, and he will easily reach the truth popularly expressed in this text, about which the nature of the subject forbids us to enlarge. Well, then, if Paul could speak of man sinning "without the body," when they really sinned in the body, is it not possible for him to have meant, when he speaks of being caught up to heaven "without the body," that he was *mentally caught up*, he being all the while in the body?

6. Language of a similar kind, when "visions and revelations" were being granted to other prophets, is found in holy scripture. For instance, Ezek. 11: 24, "Afterwards the spirit took me up, and brought me in a vision by the Spirit of God into Chaldea, to them of the captivity." Rev. 17: 3, "So he carried me away in the spirit into the wilderness: and I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet colored beast," &c. These were carrying away of the prophets, not "in the body," or by personal translation, but "without the body," that is, mentally, or in thought. Now, though all will admit that, however Paul was in Paradise, the Spirit caught him up there—the narrative under examination, perhaps, requires even more than such a lifting up as Ezekiel and John had on these occasions. We are inclined to think, as already mentioned, it was not a vision of realities he saw, but the realities themselves; at any rate such a view seems to be very like the import of what he writes. How then could he be caught up "out of," or rather *without* "the body?" How could he witness the realities without a corporeal translation to the locality specified? We are disposed to think that, without a translation of his person, his powers and faculties might be so wrought upon by Divine energy, that he really would behold paradise though not with his eyes, he really would hear, though not with his ears, words spoken there. This is surely not an impossibility with God. There seem to be some very wonderful powers in man, capable of being evolved by Mesmerism, for example, and if by a human influence, or by the exercise of the human will, a patient can be so mysteriously influenced; as some undeniably have been—as, for instance, to see unknown objects and persons at a considerable distance, when all his outward senses were completely locked up by the overpowering influence brought to bear on him—how can any one assert that, were greater power brought to bear on a human being, he could not see far into the universe; and, to all intents and purposes, be in new regions, though not personally translated to the unknown localities? If feeble man can do the one, may not God Almighty be able to effect the other? Paul does not tell us how he was "caught up without the body," if such was the manner of his exaltation; and, when research is now casting light on human capacities, and evolving most singular capabilities in man, we are surely taught that, through some supernatural energy, which, to some extent, may be illustrated (observe, we only say *illustrated*) by Mesmeric influence, the thing we have supposed may be done; and, perhaps, was the very thing that, in Paul's case, was performed. Should this be rejected—and one would require to know a great deal more than science has yet disclosed ere he could rationally declare our hypothesis inadmissable—there remains the language of the prophets to fall back upon, such as that quoted above from Ezekiel and John. And if these prophets were "caught up" and "carried away" in the spirit, in the same way Paul may have been: without requiring us to adopt the popular, and extreme, and somewhat horrible supposition that God disembodied Paul's spirit, even admitting that such a thing was possible, and so really for a while put his servant to death, that he might witness what was never intended for any person's use but his own—which could surely have been declared to him in vision at least, by his being caught up in spirit like Ezekiel, and which method would have gained the end nearly as well. However, we prefer our own hypothesis, and will keep our mind open to light, as we recommend our readers to do also.

VII. The doctrine of the entire cessation of being at death till a resurrection, would relieve us from the disagreeable necessity of supposing that Jesus called back the spirit of Lazarus from heaven, to enter again into its clayey and mortal tabernacle. Every thinking person must have felt much difficulty in the narrative on such a supposition; but, if death ends for the time the whole man, if living being has entirely paused at death, the necessity of such a violent conjecture, to which the narrative assuredly gives no countenance, is removed and the sublimity of the miracle is heightened. Jesus spake, and the dead man, the dead soul Lazarus revived! It was an act of Divine power, and of unmingled benevolence.

VIII. It may be mentioned, as a fact not unworthy of notice, that even the phrase "the resurrection of the body," so common in the religious instruction of our day, is not in all the Bible. The scriptures speak about the resurrection in this manner: "Thy dead men shall live," "the resurrection of the dead"—"touching the resurrection of the dead"—"the hope and resurrection of the dead," &c. Paul speaks, no doubt, of "the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body," Rom. 8: 23, but it is questionable if here, and in similar instances, "body" is not used for *self*, and, if such be the case, he means the redemption of ourselves, or simply our redemption from the grave to live immortally with Jesus. Examples can easily be found in which the term "body" expresses the whole of man, whatever view may be taken of him, whether a compound of soul and spirit or wholly soul. For instance—"a body (entire humanity) hast thou prepared me:" Heb. 10: 5. "My substance" or, according to the margin, "my body (or I) was not hid from thee, when I was made in secret," Ps. 139: 5. "That thy whole body (person—being) should be cast into hell," (Gehenna,) Matt. 5: 29. "The light of the body (of the man) is the eye," 6: 22. "Thy whole body (thou, or the whole man (shall be full of darkness." 6: 23. "Through the offering of the body of Jesus," that is, by the offering of Jesus, Heb. 10: 10. "The tongue defileth the whole body," [the whole

man,] James 3: 6. "Present your bodies [yourselves] a living sacrifice," Rom. 12: 1, &c. It is, then, clearly a scriptural mode of speech to import entire man by the word body, and we suggest that it is highly probable that such an expression as "the redemption of the body" just signifies our final and complete redemption by the glorious resurrection, about which the apostles and the early christians delighted to speak so much. The salvation, redemption, and adoption of believers is not completed at once; a part is effected now, a part at the resurrection, when the great work of Divine love and power will be consummated. 1 Peter 1: 4–9. Even regeneration appears to be represented as progressive, or rather, as having two stages, a new birth now by the influence of gospel truth; and a new birth by the resurrection to immortality when the Lord comes. Hence we read "Neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." Luke 20: 36. And "Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also [in the regeneration] shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. Matt. 19: 28.

IX. Should the reader see cause, from the Bible, to admit that the dead "sleep," or are unconscious till the resurrection, he will discover very clearly that "Purgatory" and the intercession of saints in heaven, &c., maintained by the Romanists, are fabrications and delusions. If the dead are conscious after death, it is difficult to see how a very satisfactory demonstration that these are errors and absurdities can be furnished.

X. The reader should not be hindered from admitting and humbly confessing, if he find scripture warrant, that death is a state of unconsciousness, by the bug-bear cry "Infidelity!" That death to all men, good and bad, is an "eternal sleep" is the opinion of, at least, many infidels, and, in maintaining this they contradict God, who says by his Son, "the hour is coming, in which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." John 5: 28, 29. Many christians in America, and not a few in Great Britain, now believe that the dead sleep, and "know not anything," till the resurrection; and the only question for the reader to determine is this, does the Bible teach that doctrine or no? It neither makes a man a christian, to believe the dead are conscious nor unconscious, and this ought to be prominently kept in mind: but if our God declares they are unconscious, it is the duty of every follower of Jesus to believe it, and, by admitting the truth, to cease from holding what inspiration denies. "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isa. 8: 20. Such is the Divine rule to guide us in this and every religious matter, and the reader is affectionately entreated to follow it honestly and faithfully, as he shall answer to God at the great day of judgment.

—o—

THE TENT MEETING, at Buffalo, N. Y., commencing Sept. 2d, we design to attend. THE CHRISTIAN TRUTH-SEEKER, *fifth* number, will be issued as soon after our return as circumstances will allow.

—o—

"LIFE IN CHRIST."—Br. Blain has pledged for *fifty* copies of this work on our proposal in the last Examiner. Who next will help? Let us know.

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, SEPTEMBER, 1851.

ELDER JACOB BLAIN is the Baptist Minister whose letters we published in the Examiner some time since, withholding his name. He has long been a Minister of the Gospel of the Baptist denomination, and for some time past a city missionary for Buffalo, N. Y. He has now come out fully and openly in defence of the doctrine of "Endless Life and Immortality *only* through Christ." Br. Dobney, in England, will be glad to know that this is but a part of the fruit of the circulation of his work on "Future Punishment" in the United States. Br. Blain will not come out alone; and the work has but just begun in this country; although ten years have now passed since we publicly avowed our belief, and nine since we preached the "Six Sermons," and many ministers and thousands of private christians have come into these views, yet there seems to be dawning a new era in the work; and it is likely to spread in greater power than it has ever done before: the battle is waxing warmer, the truth constantly advancing, and the weakness of our opposers is daily more apparent as they attempt to ward off the impending fate of natural immortality. It is a doomed doctrine; though we have no expectation that it will die without a desperate struggle: yet, trusting in God and the power of His *truth*, as we do who have set our hands to overthrow this "*Diana*" of Christendom, and "*Moloch*" of Protestantism, we doubt not *it will die* to rise no more. May the God of truth and love speed on the work.

—o—

"FIRST PRINCIPLES."—Two brethren have written us saying that "some months since the Bible Examiner was put into" their hands, and that they "have read them some *of late;*" and though much disinclined at first to consider the things therein presented—regarding them as *heresy*—yet now are convinced that we "are correct on the *higher* principles," but wish us to give a "Discourse in the Examiner upon *first* principles"—and ask if they are not "faith, repentance, and baptism for the remission of sins?" and conclude by saying, "give us the scripture upon this subject and then we can have a fair chance to try you to the bottom."

If these dear brethren expressed any doubt as to what are the first principles, and were fearful that they might miss them, we should feel bound to respond to their call: but it seems they wish an expression of our views not for the help of any who may be seeking to know what they must do to be saved, but that they may "have a fair chance to try "the editor of the Examiner to the bottom." It is to test us, it seems. We have no objections to being tested fully by any man or body of men to their sat-

isfaction; but it is a small thing with us to be judged of any man's judgment. He that judgeth us is the Lord. However, as one of these brethren has now subscribed for the Examiner, he will have a chance to learn what we regard as first principles; particularly if he will get the back volumes of the present series, i. e. for '48, '49 and '50, which we will send him in *sheets* for two dollars. It would seem unnecessary for us to go over the ground in a discourse simply for them to *try* us, as they can find, probably, all the information we should give them by the past volumes of the Examiner.

We will briefly state what we regard as first principles. By Adam all men are mortal, dying, corruptible creatures, and have no immortality or endless life in them; so that by generation, or birth, no man has any hope or prospect beyond this present life. Therefore, unless some other medium is provided of God, all Adam's race would perish and cease to be, or "be as though they had not been;" Obd. 16. While thus situated, God so loved the world, or race of Adam, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever *believeth* in him might *not perish*, but have *everlasting life*. He gave him to be "the resurrection and the life," without which no soul of Adam's race would ever have seen a *future life*. Here are first principles; and without understanding these distinctly and clearly, the vision of every man is beclouded, his mind more or less bewildered, and he will be very likely to substitute something else for Christ, and think more of it and talk more about it than of Him who came into the world that men might *live* through him. But men have personally sinned, therefore we call upon them in the language of Peter, Acts 3: 19, saying, "*Repent*"—change your opinions or mind concerning Christ and the work he is to accomplish for you—[for so the original signifies]—"and be *converted*"—or turned about—face the other way. They were following the first Adam, and going to death and corruption; but by turning about, following the second Adam, and being united to him by *faith*, they became "partakers of the divine nature," which is in Christ, and are thus in the way to incorruption, immortality, *eternal life;* and their sins are "blotted out," to be remembered no more; thus will "times of *refreshing* come from the presence of the Lord:" literally, a *breathing* time—to recover one's breath: in other words, the resurrection, when all who have the Spirit that was in Christ, by which God raised him up from the dead, will be made alive—made *to breathe again*, and die no more. And this will be when "God shall send Jesus Christ * * * whom the heavens" will retain "until the times of the restitution," &c.

But brethren may think we are on the higher principles again. Well, be it so. Paul was for forgetting or leaving the things behind, and reaching on to those before, "not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith towards God; of the doctrines of baptisms," &c. We shall do well not always to remain *babes*, or children, but grow "up unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ," that we may be of "full age."

—o—

THE SECOND ADVENT WATCHMAN has come to hand, since our last issue, in a new dress, much enlarged. It is now edited by W. S. Campbell *and* J. Turner, and is published weekly, at Hartford, Conn., by Dr. David Crary, Publishing Agent, at $1 for 26 numbers.

On the question of Life and Death, it is in general agreement with the Bible Examiner. On the Millenial age and the Restoration of Israel, the junior editor differs entirely from us; holding that the "thousand years" *are past;* and that the advent, now at hand, brings the entire regeneration of the earth, with none to be left remaining but those made immortal. In this respect he acts consistently as carrying out Mr. Miller's theory. Mr. Miller maintained this earth was all to be melted by fire, and every soul of man to be cut off except the saints—the new earth immediately appear, and the immortal saints with Christ alone inhabit the new earth during the thousand years to follow; at the end of which the wicked dead were to be raised—out of the new earth, of course—and be then cast into the lake of fire. Br. Turner seeing the absurdity of such a theory, and yet maintaining the entire renewal of the earth at the time of the advent, took the ground that the resurrection of the wicked would follow, immediately, that of the righteous, prior to the burning of the world and its renewal. To make this view a harmony it was necessary that the thousand years should be in the past, and so he dates that period from the overthrow of Pagan Rome and terminates it about the time of the reformation, if we understand him.

His theory is much more consistent than Mr. Miller's; and those who still hold to Mr. Miller's view of the world being burned and all renewed at *the time* of the advent, and no probation to any soul of man after, oppose Br. Turner with a poor grace, in our opinion. We respect his *opinions*, without being in the least moved by his arguments. In our own mind we have not a doubt he is in error; but not one for which he should be disfellowshipped or reviled. We cannot adopt his interpretations; but we can love him and treat him as a brother.

Were we to believe none will be left in the flesh during a protracted period following the advent, in a state of trial under some constitution of Messiah's personal reign, then we should at once adopt the spiritual reign theory, and boldly assert it impossible that the advent can occur for many years to come. One of two things is true, to our mind, viz: either there is probation to some of the human family *after*

the second advent of Christ and the change of his saints, *or* the advent is far off in the future. Here we are at present immovably fixed. The reasou is simply this: there are events in prophecy—and many of them too—which we are satisfied have never had a fulfillment, nor are they *conditional*, and which can only have their accomplishment among men in the flesh; and no system of spiritualism nor *professed* literalism that we have ever seen, has caused our mind to waver for one moment in this matter since we became settled in it in 1844 and 1845; but we have not thought best to occupy much of the Examiner with these points, as its primary object was, and is still, to illustrate and defend the great foundation truth of "*Life and Immortality only by and through our Lord Jesus Christ.*" And while we do not pledge ourself to silence on any subject, we shall not lose sight of the *special* object of the Bible Examiner. "*The Christian Truth-Seeker*" has been started by us as a free medium for all parties on any Bible topic; and if sustained will remain such.

———o———

"THE TABERNACLE OF DAVID."—If we understand Br. Turner, in the Advent Watchman of August 6th, he makes the Tabernacle of David "the gospel economy." His words are, "To look for the tabernacle of David yet to be set up, is to look for the gospel economy in a coming dispensation." This is the conclusion of an argument in which he says some very true things; but his "conclusion" from the true things he wrote does not follow at all, in our judgment. The tabernacle of David to be set up, James expressly tells us, Acts 15: 16, is that which had previously "*fallen down*," and was in "*ruins!*" Now the tabernacle in heaven, of which Br. T. speaks very true things, never had *fallen down*, nor was it in *ruins*, and therefore needed no restoring from its ruins, nor setting up; or if it had fallen down, it was never the tabernacle of *David*, for he had not ascended to heaven in Peter's time: see Acts 2: 34. This then cannot be the tabernacle James speaks of. Neither can it be the "gospel economy," for that had not *fallen down* nor fallen into ruins, either in the apostle's day, nor at any previous period. Whatever the tabernacle of David is, it is clear to us Br. Turner has missed finding it in his argument. We may not agree with those who think it is the *literal* house of David; though the term *tabernacle* is used in scripture, frequently, to signify a literal house; but usually, in such cases, includes the *family* dwelling in it: see Jeb 5: 24; 18: 6, 14, 15, and various other texts.

The original words, in Hebrew, translated *tabernacle*, are defined by Prof. Pick as follows, viz: "1st. *Mishkon*, the Tabernacle which God commanded Moses to make. Ex. 25: 8, 9, as a pattern for the Temple. 2d. *Ouhel*, a tent, Tabernacle of the Congregation. It is also the tent attached to the Tabernacle, where Moses and the Elders transacted all public matters. It is the tent which was covered with the pillar of the cloud. Numb. 12: 5, 10. 3d. *Sikkoth*, the name of an idol; literally, a *protector*. 4th. *Sokkoth*, an awning, a shelter from the heat."—*Bible Student's Concordance.*

The most natural construction, it seems to us, to put upon the phrase, the tabernacle of David, is, *the house of David*, i. e. the royal house of David, including his *throne* and kingdom. This throne was originally in Jerusalem, on Mount Zion, and embraced the kingdom of Israel, east of the Mediterranean sea. That kingdom was *overturned*, [see Ezek. 21: 25–27,] and its *throne cast* DOWN to the ground; compare Ezek 21: 27, with Psa. 89: 44, where, speaking of David's throne, prophetically, it is said "Thou hast made his glory to cease, and cast his throne down to the ground." Thus the throne was to "*fall down*" and be in "*ruins*," and the kingdom to be "*overturned*," and thus remain "*till he come whose right it is*," then God said he would "give it to him:" of course to "build *again the ruins thereof*, and *set it up*," as James saith; and to this agree the words of Isa. 9: 7, where the prophet, speaking of Messiah, saith—"Of the increase of his government and peace —no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order [Heb. *koon—to set firm, to establish*—Prof. Pick: to *re-establish it*—Septuagint] and to establish [Sep. *support*] it with judgment and justice from henceforth even forever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this."

Here then is a building again and a setting up the tabernacle of David that is fallen down; such a setting up and building as has never yet taken place; and is, we have no doubt, with present light, the thing that James speaks of, Acts 15, which was future when he spoke, though the *time* was unknown to the apostles; as Jesus had told them, Acts 1: 7, it was not for them to know the times and seasons which the Father had put in his own power for the restoring "the kingdom *again* to Israel;" which restoration includes the setting up *again* the royal house—throne and kingdom—of David. Such we are confident is the true meaning of the phraseology under consideration.

———o———

TIMES OF RESTITUTION.—"Times," Acts 3: 21, is *chronon*, marking a *succession* of events; and not *kairos*, a point of time, a fixed, definite period, as in the 19th verse. See Acts 17: 30. *Chronon* includes necessarily *protracted* time and often *long* time: see Matt. 25: 19, and Luke 8: 27, and 20: 9; John 5: 6. Sometimes *chronos* has the qualifying term *mikron—little*—connected with it: see John 7: 33, and 12: 35. This last expression shows that there is a LONG *chronos:* and when expressed as in Acts 3: 21, signifies a *protracted* period, without defining its length, but implying a *long time:* besides the term "*achri*,"

translated "until" in the text, gives the *plural* form to *chronos* making it *chronon*, and hence utterly forbidding a *short* period. The *times* of restitution therefore is a *protracted period*. It commences with the heavens unveiling Christ on his return to earth, and terminates with making *all things new;* Rev. 21: 5–6; and *it is done.*

———o———

THE ADVENT HARBINGER.—We would once more call attention to the Advent Harbinger, published at Rochester, N. Y., by *Joseph Marsh.* It is in harmony with the Examiner on the Life and Death question; and has, within the past two years, espoused essentially the same view of the character of the age to follow the advent. It had previously maintained the same view as Mr. Miller on the last named topic. Its change of views has given great offence to certain *infallibles*, and the most untiring efforts have been made to crush it and its editor; but he has nobly stood his ground, and advanced in the conflict. We hope those who have the means will help to sustain him, and become subscribers to his paper. It is a large quarto of eight pages, published weekly at $1 for 26 numbers. Br. Marsh has also published a pamphlet, of 128 pages, 12mo., setting forth his views of *"The Age to Come,"* &c., which we hope may have a wide circulation. Price 12½ cents single copy, $1,12½ per dozen, or $9 per hundred. Orders for it should be addressed to him at Rochester, New York. We have a few copies on hand.

———o———

POSTAGE.—Let all keep in mind that if they order books, pamphlets, or any other printed matter—except regular papers, and those to *bona fide* subscribers—that the postage has to be pre-paid by us; and hence to secure works sent by mail, you must *add* to your remittance the amount to be pre-paid. None need expect their orders answered who do not comply in this matter. Also, when persons write us on their own business it would seem reasonable that they should pre-pay their postage. Is it right to make us pay *five* cents, besides our trouble, to *change* the direction of a subscriber's paper, when it might have been done for *three?*

———o———

## SCRIPTURE EXPOSITION.

BY THE EDITOR.

[Continued from page 127.]

Finally, be ye all of one mind, having compassion one of another: love as brethren, be pitiful, be courteous. Not rendering evil for evil, or railing for railing; but contrariwise, blessing: knowing that ye are thereunto called, that ye should inherit a blessing.—1 PETER III. 8 and 9.

"Finally"—*telos*—at length—"be ye all of one mind"—*omophrones*—be united, unanimous, like minded: specially relating to that spirit of order and subjection of which he had previously spoken: without that there can be no unity, but rather division—"having compassion one of another"—*sumpatheis*—sympathising one with another. Here the sympathy of one member of the body for each and all the other members is hinted at as illustrating the state of mind each member of Christ should have for his fellow member in all things, and graciously growing out of the one mind they were exhorted to. "Love as brethren"—*philadelphoi*—exercise and exhibit that mutual affection to each other which your relation to Christ demands: hence—"be pitiful"—tender-hearted—"be courteous"—friendly-minded, affectionate—"not rendering evil for evil"—not giving back evil for evil—"nor railing for railing"—reproaching, opprobrious and abusive language:—"but contrariwise blessing"—on the other hand bestow blessings—strive to make happy. The evil actor, who uses abusive language and reproaches others, does so because he is himself unhappy; do not add to his unhappiness by acting as he does, but by an opposite course strive to lead him to repentance and reformation: "knowing that ye are thereunto called, that ye should inherit a blessing:"—by pursuing the course pointed out, whatever is the result on the offender you will find a blessing to yourselves: for so hath God appointed, that no effort to do good or be good shall go unrewarded.

For he that will love life, and see good days, let him refrain his tongue from evil, and his lips that they speak no guile. Let him eschew evil, and do good; let him seek peace, and ensue it.—10 and 11.

"For he that will love life"—even an *endless life*—"and see"—enjoy, possess—"good days"—even the days of an eternity to come, full of goodness flowing from the inexhaustible fountain of goodness—"let him refrain"—prohibit, cause to cease, desist, leave off—"his tongue from evil"—malediction, cursing—"and his lips that they speak no guile"—deception, fraud, falsehood:—"let him eschew"—shut out, exclude, keep back—"evil, and do good:" as he *shuts out* evil let him *bring in* good—that which is profitable, fertilizing—"let him seek peace"—concord, unity—"and ensue it"—pursue it, follow, adhere to it.

For the eyes of the Lord are over the righteous, and his ears are open to their prayers: but the face of the Lord is against them that do evil.—12.

"The eyes of the Lord are over the righteous"—the character previously described. The Lord has a special regard and care for such; so that he is represented as constantly looking after their interest and welfare—"and his ears open to their prayers"—supplications. The Lord is always mindful of their wants and necessities—"but the face of the Lord is against"—[an expression denoting opposition and resistance to]—"them that do evil." So long as men persist in doing evil their professions and prayers will be disregarded of the Lord, and only increase

their guilt." "*Cease to do evil*," is the voice of Prophets, of Jesus Christ, and the Apostles; and he who heeds it not will pray in vain, and in vain seek admission into the incorruptible inheritance—the Lord's face is *against* him.

And who is he that will harm you, if ye be followers of that which is good?—13.

It might be objected, if we possess the meek, quiet, submissive, unrevengeful spirit enjoined, we shall be the subjects of injury from evil-minded, malicious persons who are disposed to do us hurt. To this the apostle replies by asking a question, which imports the strongest assurance of protection that could be given. As much as to say, it is impossible that any real harm or injury can befall you: you are in God's hands, and he will see to it, if you follow his directions, that you receive no real or lasting injury, but he will cause all the malice of your enemies to be overruled for your greater good and advancement. The case of Joseph, sold in Egypt—the case of Daniel and the three Hebrews, may illustrate this truth: but, especially, the case of our once suffering Lord Jesus, now exalted, and soon to have the "kingdom of this world."

But, and if ye suffer for righteousness' sake, happy are ye: and be not afraid of their terror, neither be troubled: But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts: and be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear; Having a good conscience: that whereas they speak evil of you, as of evil-doers, they may be ashamed that falsely accuse your good conversation in Christ.—14, 15 and 16.

"If ye suffer for righteousness' sake"—for pursuing the manner of life previously described—"happy"—blessed—"are ye:" because, if we suffer with Christ—for attachment to him and his manner of life—we shall be glorified and reign with him. "And be not afraid"—do not frighten yourselves, nor be frightened by—"their terror"—their fearful, terrible exhibitions of malice and wickedness towards you—"neither be troubled"—agitated, disturbed, disquieted, perplexed: commit all into the hands of God, and rest in him after the pattern of your once suffering Lord, and all will be well: blessed rest. "But sanctify"—set apart, consecrate—"the Lord God in your hearts"—minds: that is, honor God by reposing unshaken confidence and trust in him whatever your circumstances or trials may be: "and be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you, a reason"—an account, a cause—"of the hope"—the trust and confidence—"that is in you"—that you have in exercise: which, of course, relates to the incorruptible inheritance and that preparation needful to prepare us for it: do this when asked—"with meekness"—mildness, gentleness, kindness—"and fear," lest you should say anything that might dishonor God and prove injurious to men. "Having a good conscience"—holding, or keeping a mind conscious of good—the clear conviction of well doing:—"that whereas they speak evil of you"—speak against you, calumniate, slander you—"as evil doers"—working harm, injury—"they may be ashamed"—confounded, disconcerted—"that falsely accuse your good conversation"—your good course of life, conduct, or deportment—"in Christ;" or *for* Christ. The Christian lives *in* Christ, and *for* Christ; and all his mode of life should evidence this; showing that to pattern after Christ, or to be Christ-like, is that for which he lives.

For it is better, if the will of God be so, that ye suffer for well-doing, than for evil doing. For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit.—17 and 18.

The apostle here states that Christians, if they must suffer, had better suffer for faithful adherence to God and righteousness than for evil doing; and again reverts to the "example" of Christ, and says, "For"—*oti*—because—"Christ *also* hath once suffered"—that is, during his whole public life, even until death—"for"—*peri*—from, through, or by—"sins"—i. e. wickedness of men—"the just"—*dikaios*—being perfect, blameless, innocent, one approved of God—"for"—*uper*—on account of, or by—"the unjust." The apostle's argument is this: If it is God's pleasure that we should suffer by an association with wicked men, it is better that we do so in consequence of right action than wrong; that we may honor God and his cause after the example of Jesus our Lord and head; "because" Christ also suffered from the wickedness of men, though he was blameless, and he suffered even unto death by their sins, or injustice, and he did this—"that he might"—by his example of patience, and manifestation of love to his enemies show the greatness of his Father's love, and thereby—"bring us to God"—that we might be reconciled to God, and receive his mercy unto life everlasting: and, so great was the love of Christ, that he suffered even to the—"being put to death in the flesh;"—of course really died, having come in the flesh, he actually died in it—not merely escaped out of it, but died *in* it. But the glorious reward of his thus honoring God by patient suffering from sinners, that he might win them to God, he was—"quickened"—made alive—"by the Spirit" of God: for, God raised him up from the dead. From this example let Christians learn to suffer patiently, as Christ also—in like manner—has suffered, that *they* may lead men to glorify their Father in heaven.

By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; Which sometimes were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water.—19 and 20.

"By which [spirit] also he [God, who raised up

Christ from the dead] went and preached unto the spirits in prison"—*phulake*---in guard, watch, in custody: or as the Syriac version renders it, *in sepulchro*, i. e. in the grave? Those to whom the spirit of God acted as a reprover in the days of Noah, [see Gen. 6: 3,] and who were "disobedient," are now in prison, in guard, in the grave; and lay there without any principle of eternal life connected with them, because they quenched that spirit which had now raised up Christ from the dead, and which dwelling in men will quicken them to immortality and endless life as truly as it did Christ: so that if it is the will of God that we suffer even unto death, as Christ did, for well doing, we have nothing to fear; while those who injure us, dying without that Spirit in them, will as certainly perish as the sinners in the days of Noah. God's spirit strove with them, while the ark was preparing, through Noah, a preacher of righteousness; and did so with long-suffering; but they did not profit by it, and were swept away, and are shut up in the grave, where there is no hope, for, there is *no work, nor knowledge, nor wisdom* in the grave: see Eccles. 9: 10. Let all those who resist God's spirit remember this. Noah and his family "were saved," or preserved alive---"by"---*dia*---through, or *during the time* of the "water," i. e. the flood—by obeying that Spirit, by means of the ark which bore them above the destroying waters.

> The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us, (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ: Who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him.—21 and 22.

"The like figure"—or, in like manner, corresponding to this---"baptism" of the Spirit; for, that is the reference---the Spirit raised up Christ---the reception of that Spirit preserved Noah and his family---the rejection of that Spirit brought a flood of water on the spirits now in prison, by which they were destroyed. That spirit received—baptised into the body of Christ by it; for, "by one Spirit we are all baptised into one body," [1 Corth. 12: 13,] as Noah and his family by one Spirit were all brought into the ark—a type, or figure of Christ—thus baptised, we are now saved, or preserved to an eternal life, of which we have the assurance---"by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead" *by* that Spirit.

"Who is gone into heaven"—as our fore-runner, and as the evidence and pledge of our partaking in his glory, if we are partakers of the same Spirit that raised him up from the dead, which glory is, that he "is on the right hand of God, angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him"---even all power in heaven and earth given unto him, so that he can accomplish whatsoever he will for his church, his body.

Or, we may understand the apostle as simply asserting *the fact*, that the baptism of the Spirit, by which we are saved, i. e. *preserved*, was, and is the result of Jesus Christ's resurrection from the dead, and ascension into heaven: and the last verses may be thus paraphrased: "The Spirit of God, by which Jesus was was raised from the dead, was that which strove with men prior to the flood, and which led Noah and his family into the ark, wherein they were preserved during the time of the water, or flood, being upon the earth; and in like manner the Spirit now poured out upon us, doth preserve us, by leading us into Christ as Noah was led into the ark, which baptism of ths Spirit is by—*dia*---*through* the resurrection of Jesus Christ; who has gone into heaven and is on the right hand of God, as I told my hearers on the day of Penticost, when I said, This Jesus hath God raised up whereof we all are witnesses; and being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit he hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear."

Such, it appears to us, is the plain and unsophisticated meaning of the apostle. Noah was not saved, i. e. preserved, *by* water; but he was preserved *through* the time of the water, or flood, by heeding and being led by the Spirit into the ark; while the rest of the world by resisting that Spirit were destroyed *by* water, being swept away by the flood. Our salvation or destruction, in like manner, turns on the reception or rejection of that Spirit.

---o---

INQUIRIES BY A HEARER.—Sunday Afternoon.---*Mr. Storrs:*---Having listened to your discourse of this morning, in which you stated that man or Adam was created merely a natural man, earthly, animal, &c., it seemed to me that if that be a fact, how can we reconcile it with the statement in Gen. 1: 26, which reads thus, "And God said, let us make man in our image, after our likeness," &c. and 27th verse, "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he them," &c.?

Now, if man was made in the image of God, are we to conclude that God, who inhabits eternity, the omnipresent God, has such a form as the natural man? and that in that sense man is created in his image? This seems to me not to be the true meaning of the text. I rather incline to the belief that man was made in the image of God in relation to the purity and holiness of God, and that he did not become earthly, &c., until after his fall.

I think you also stated in the early part of your discourse, that our Saviour was not immortal, else he could not have died; and afterwards I understood you to say that he was created spiritual, and not as other men.

REPLY TO HEARER.—One of two things is true, in our opinion, man was created in the image of God

relative to some *one attribute*, or else in relation to *form*. God has many attributes, such as *omnipotence, omnipresent, omniscience, unchangeability, eternity, immortality, independence*, implying *dominion*, with all his *moral* perfections in *absolute perfection*. Now, if we cannot say that man was created in the image of God in all these respects, there must be *a reason* for selecting some *one* or more of them as that in which the image consisted; and the text must be the guide in our choice; only *one* thing is expressed, viz: *dominion*, i. e. man was to be *independent* in all his acts; not to be *interfered* with by any *other creature*. This was necessary to bring out *moral perfection*, as there can be no moral perfection where *independence* of other creatures does not exist. All other creatures were therefore made subject to the creature man, and hence *moral manifestations* were not expected of them. Man was *independent* of all other creatures, and had *dominion* over them; herein consisted the likeness and image of God.

In our mind there is only one other alternative, and that is, that God is possessed of *a form*; after the likeness and image of which the animal man was created. We do not find anything in the Bible necessarily opposed to this view, but some things favor it. God's Spirit fills heaven and earth; see Psa. 139: 7–9. But that God has a *personal form*, many texts of scripture clearly intimate. See Ex. 33: 23; 1 Kg. 22: 19; Isa. 6: 1; Dan. 7: 9; Acts 7: 55, 56; Heb. 1–3.

On the second difficulty of a "Hearer," a *spiritual nature* is not necessarily immortal; *necessary immortality* belongs to God alone. A spiritual nature may have also various degrees of perfection. Christ *united the spiritual and animal natures* in his person: see Heb. 2: 9–18; also, see John 1: 14. He did thus unite the two natures that he might raise man to a spiritual nature, which, when perfected, ends in immortality—endless life. When this is done, then has mortality put on immortality, or "mortality is swallowed up of life."

———o———

ELDER BLAIN.—After our notice of this brother, in another column, was in type, he arrived in this city. He has shown us his letter of exclusion from the Washington street Baptist Church, Buffalo, N. Y., on account of holding the doctrine, and preaching it, that the punishment of the wicked is extinction of being, and not endless torture. He asked of that church a letter of dismission and recommendation to sister churches, but in view of the fact that he had recently confessed himself a convert to the doctrine above named, a letter was refused.

At a subsequent meeting, Br. Blain avowed his fixed determination to maintain and publish the doctrine he had embraced. In consequence, the church resolved to withdraw the hand of fellowship from him.

Elder Blain was a City Missionary in Buffalo, and held connection with the aforesaid church with an unblemished character, except his present faith on the end of the wicked. He still adheres to Baptist doctrines and usages, and wishes to be known as a Baptist; but is determined to enjoy his Christian liberty to read and publish the testimony of God, as he understands it. We are glad that he has been enabled, through the mercy of God, to make the choice "*to obey God rather than man.*" He will now devote himself entirely to the work of proclaiming "*Life and Immortality through Jesus Christ alone;*" and will travel and preach where the door shall be open for him. He is near sixty years old, has been many years a Baptist minister, and has an extensive acquaintance in various parts of the country. He designs removing his residence from Buffalo, but is not yet settled on any particular place. May the blessing of the great Head of the church attend his labors in this city and wherever he shall proclaim the truth.

The following article from an English work was handed us by Br. Blain:

"EXTRACTS FROM 'ESSAYS IN ECCLESIASTICAL BIOGRAPHY.' By the Right Hon. Sir James Stephens, K. C. B."—These essays originally appeared as articles in the Edinburgh Review, and the following extract is made from the author's 'Epilogue,' now first published, in which he avows, without reserve, 'opinions,' which had been 'rather suggested or assumed, than explicitly stated, in the preceding pages.'

"The doctrine of the eternity of the future retribution forms no *necessary* substratum of any other Christian doctrine. If it could be completely disproved, its disappearance would not dissolve, nor apparently impair, the strength of any other part of that mighty fabric. Every argument, every narrative, every expostulation, every warning in the Bible, would be as complete and intelligible, if not as emphatical, without it as with it. The same thing cannot be said of any other of the main truths revealed in the Holy Scriptures. Each of them is an integral part of the system to which it belongs. Is it then, probable, that a doctrine, which, if true, infinitely outweighs, in importance all the rest of the articles of our creeds, should have been propounded as a mere isolated truth standing in no necessary connection with the rest? Is it not far more probable, that there is an error in that construction of our Saviour's words, which would render him the promulgator of it?

"The angel who descended from heaven and proclaimed to the shepherds the incarnation of the Redeemer, announced himself as the herald 'of good tidings of great joy which should be to all people.' But if it be indeed true, that He who was thus made incarnate, proclaimed an eternity of unutterable woe to the vast majority of those, who, from generation

to generation, throng our streets, our marts and our churches, how shall we reconcile the angelic announcement with this awful proclamation? The Gospel is, indeed, intelligence of blessedness, to 'the *few* who are chosen;' but the same Gospel is, on the popular hypothesis, not less intelligence of wretchedness, surpassing imagination, to 'the *many* who are called.' Is not, therefore, the accuracy of that hypothesis involved in much improbability?

"The Bible teaches us, that Christ came into the world to bruise the serpent's head, to destroy the works of the devil, and to establish the kingdom of God; and Christ himself declared that 'He saw Satan like lightning fall from Heaven.' Is it reasonable to accept any construction of the other words of Christ, which would seem to ascribe to the Spirit of Evil an eternal triumph over the Spirit of Good, in the persons of the vast majority of the race whom he lived and died to redeem?

"In our present life, trouble, pain, and sorrow, are indeed, thickly sown. But they exist among us as anomalies, not as laws—as the medicinal and remedial provisions which the Creative wisdom has infused into this economy of things, not as the ultimate end contemplated by that wisdom. In this world, 'nothing terminates on evil;' although, in this world, evil so unhappily abounds. Do not, therefore, all the analogies of the Divine government raise a strong presumption against that interpretation of our Saviour's discourse, which represents him as foretelling a future economy of things, in which evil, not remedial but penal, not transient but eternal, is to be the doom of the vast majority of the children of Adam?

"Throughout the Holy Scriptures, a constant appeal is made to those moral sentiments, which God himself has implanted in our nature. Our heavenly Father has graciously condescended everywhere to point out to us the sacred harmony between His law as revealed by prophets and evangelists, and His law as written by himself on our hearts; and from that harmony we are taught to draw the best and highest proof of the inspiration of those sacred writings. Deeply conscious with what profound reverence it behooves us to apply that test of truth to any opinion deduced by the Church at large from Holy Scripture, we may yet venture to inquire whether it could be successfully applied in the case under consideration? If the words ascribed to our Saviour are not inexorably bound down to the construction they usually receive, by the absolutely inflexible force of the text and of the context, is it not most reasonable to adopt some other construction, to which our own natural sense of justice and equity can respond as clearly as it responds to all the rest of the inspired canon?

"So inveterate is the corruption of the human heart that, in the judgment of some, the infliction and announcement of no penalty less than that of eternal misery would be sufficient to turn it aside from present sinfulness. But does the dread of that terrific penalty really stem the headlong current of iniquity? Is it really productive of any corresponding alarm? Does it produce an alarm equal to that which would have been excited by the announcement of a penalty of infinitely less amount, but definite and intelligible? Does the world—does the Church—do her ministers—do her saints—really believe this part of the language of our Redeemer in that sense in which they familiarly interpret it? Is any human mind so constituted as to bear the incumbent weight of so fearful a probability of evil so utterly beyond the reach of exaggeration? Is the texture of any human body vigorous enough to sustain the throes of so agonizing an anticipation? What means the whole course and system of life which is hourly passing before our eyes, and through which we are ourselves passing? Why have our preachers time to engage in study, to harmonize the periods of their sermons, to give heed to our wretched ecclesiastical disputes, to devote one superflous instant to food, to repose, or to occupy themselves with any other thing than the proclamation of the horrors of the approaching calamity, and the only way of escape from it? Let any honest man fairly propose to himself, and fairly answer the question, whether the unutterable disparity between his actual interest in all the frivolities of life, and his professed belief in an eternity of woe, impending probably over himself, but certainly over the vast majority of the human race, does not convict him of professing to believe more than he actually believes? And, if so, is there not some reason to doubt whether he has not erred in attributing to his Saviour a meaning, for which, after all, he cannot find any real place in his own mind, or any vital influence on his own heart?"

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.—The writer of the foregoing article does not tell us what he thinks will be the end of the wicked; and most likely had never examined the question of their literal destruction. He has, however, reasoned very conclusively against the notion of endless torture.

---

"TRUTH AGAINST FICTION."—Such is the title of a pamphlet we have just issued of 84 pages, 12mo. It contains the last three chapters of H. H. Dobney's "Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment;" in which there is an "*Examination of particular texts*" suppposed to establish the common notion of endless misery, and the popular *objections* to the doctrine of the *destruction* of the wicked are "*considered.*"

We have published this pamphlet by the special request of Br. Blain, and under the conviction that he is right in his judgment that it is well calculated to meet the inquiries of those who have little time to read. Let it be sent off by thousands. Price 12½ cents single; $8 per hundred.

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VI. PHILADELPHIA, OCTOBER, 1851. NO. 10

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,
At No. 52 Vine Street, below Second.
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, $1; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; always in advance.

## THE FUTURE STATE.

BY REV. REGINALD COURTENAY, A. M.

[Continued from page 102.]

*The Dependence of the Mind upon the Bodg.*

There are many persons who, notwithstanding the authority of numerous passages of Scripture, such as those quoted in the last chapter, are averse to the supposition of a total sleep after death. The import of the biblical texts which seem to promise a state of consciousness will be considered in the third part of this work: our only concern at present is with the *physical* reasons which may be advanced in support of such a view. "It is true," it may be said, "that we are cut off from the *external* world by the loss of the organs of sense, but the faculties of memory, hope, imagination, reason, may continue as active as before. Our senses tie us down to things immediately around us; but these faculties are able to transport us in a moment into the regions of the future and the unseen, and endow us even with a kind of creative power; they burst the bounds of time and space, by which all corporeal, all terrestrial things are limited, as if in anticipation of a season of still greater energy, when they shall be hampered no more by this cumbrous clog of clay."

The dignity of the faculties for which this extensive freedom is claimed may, very naturally, prevent suspicion in the minds of uninformed persons, that they, as well as the bodily senses, require a material mechanism for the performance of their functions. But nevertheless, the number of facts accumulated by modern researches on this subject is so great, and the conclusion drawn from them so decisive, that it may now be unhesitatingly declared, even of the most exalted flights of the human mind, that *a brain* is as indispensable to them, as nerves are to enable the fingers to feel. "In animals, where little mental power exists, there is a proportionate absence of cerebral organization; and in man, where such mental powers are found in the highest degree, the cerebral organization is the most elaborate. Again, when in man the whole brain has become torpid from disease, an alteration takes place, and he is *reduced in point of intellect to a level with the lowest animals;* he is capable of taking his food, but all other voluntary action is lost, in proportion as the disease prevails. Now what is the case when the brain is excited to an unusual state of activity? We find a corresponding alteration, that is, an increased activity, in the mental manifestations. In the ordinary use of fermented liquors, until, from their being taken to excess, torpor is superinduced by a *quasi* apoplexy, the operation of the mind, the sentiments, and the passions, are quickened in the same ratio in which the stimulus increases the action of the brain." * * * "The intellectual powers and feelings are *never* completely restored, if the inflammatory action has remained unsubdued until the organization of the brain and its membranes has become permanently injured." * * * "It is quite clear that every other part of the body may be diseased or even totally destroyed; and still, if the brain continue to be healthy, the mental manifestations will remain unaffected. May we not then from these instances fairly conclude that there is a necessary connexion between the mental manifestations and the state of the brain, and that, at all events, in these extremes, cases of *complete torpor*, and excited action, the injurious alteration which results, is to be traced to the state of the brain?" "We know that the assistance of the brain is necessary to our intellectual manifestations, to our sentiments, and to our passions."*

And further, if the superior powers of the mind were independent of the bodily organization, those material causes which, as we know, destroy sensation, and the power of voluntary motion, would not affect *them;* and reason, and imagination, and whatever faculties are more excellent than the rest, would remain in full vigor, while the body was in a state of stupor, or in convulsions.

In confirmation of this view that the brain is the organ of the mind, without which the latter is as incapable of internal action, as it is of perceiving external things without the bodily senses, it may be fearlessly alleged, that each *part* of the brain is the organ of a *separate* faculty of the mind; and that no faculty exists which has not its appropriate organ. These faculties have been distinguished; and the brain marked out with such precision, as to enable any one who pleases, with practice and patient attention, to bring the truth of the phrenological theory to an experimental test. "The organs of the mind can be seen and felt, and their size estimated—and the mental manifestations also that accompany them can be observed, in an unlimited number of instances."† The truth of the general theory, which

* Ellis on Insanity, page 18, &c. According to Dr. John Abercrombie, however, there are circumstances in which the brain has been extensively diseased, "without the phenomena of mind being impaired in any sensible degree." This holds true both in regard to the destruction of each individual part of the brain, and likewise to the extent to which the cerebral mass may be diseased or destroyed. "A man mentioned by Dr. Terriar, who died of an affection of the brain, retained all his faculties entire till the very moment of death, which was sudden; on examining his head, the whole right hemisphere, that is, one-half of his brain, was found destroyed by suppuration." Several other instances, which it is not worth while here to give in detail, are mentioned by Dr. Abercrombie. In most of these cases, it should be observed, the disease has attacked only *one side of the head;* and as the organs on each side correspond exactly one to the other, each organ being in fact *double*, there is no reason why disease should impair the activity of mind in a greater, if in so great a degree, as the loss of one eye or ear impairs the faculty of seeing or hearing.

† The Constitution of Man considered in relation to External Objects. By George Coombe.

is all that need here be insisted on, is confirmed not merely by scattered and miscellaneous instances, but in well ascertained and striking *classes* of instances. The mental characteristic of the principal races and nations of mankind, and of the sexes, and of infancy, youth, manhood, and old age, are well known, and the agreement between the development or deficiency of particular faculties and of particular parts of the brain is found to subsist, upon so extensive a scale, as to preclude the possibility of doubt as to the general fact, that the brain is the organ of the mind. *No* faculties, not even those which impel us to discover and adore a Supreme Being, or recognise the force of moral obligations, can in this world dispense with the aid of a *material* mechanism.* Immeasurably exalted as we are, by the possession of these powers, above the brutes, we yet do not appear to have made any approach, *physically* speaking, to an exemption from the general law of mortality.

If it is reasonable to conclude, that after death we shall no longer feel, or hear, or see, because those material organs are destroyed, or impeded in some essential function, by which we felt and heard and saw, it is also reasonable to conclude that *we shall cease to think, when the organs of thought are rendered incapable of action.*

It is very possible that the real nature and force of this conclusion may be misapprehended. It does not go so far as to assert, that nothing beyond mere particles of matter survives the dissolution of the body. For though we be incapable of thought or feeling, an immaterial principle which once animated the body, and by which, or rather with which, we thought and felt, *may* still continue to exist. But it does assert that, at death, a suspension, a total suspension of *every* faculty of the mind ensues.

Such a suspension of the mental energies sometimes takes place without the *dissolution* of the body; in consequence of some severe bodily injury or other impediment to the corporeal functions; and ceases when the impediment is removed. "A man was pressed on board one of his majesty's ships early in the late revolutionary war. While on board this vessel, in the Mediterranean, he received a fall from the yard-arm, and when he was picked up, was found to be insensible." So he continued for a long space of time, utterly incapable of motion, except of the lips and tongue when he wanted food. Above thirteen months afterwards he was trepanned, and gradually, in the space of four or five days, recovered his senses. "For a period of thirteen months and some days," says Sir A. Cooper, "his mind had remained in a state of perfect oblivion; he had drank, as it were, the cup of Lethe; he had suffered a COMPLETE DEATH as far as regarded his mental, and almost all his bodily powers; but by removing a small portion of bone with the saw, he was at once restored to all the functions of his mind, and almost all the powers of his body." It is to no purpose to inquire what becomes of the immaterial part during the interval of torpor; or attempt to decide whether it ceases to *be*, or merely ceases to *act*. All consciousness ceases—and arguing from analogy we suppose that the same thing happens when we die; and it matters but little whether any living *powers*, or thinking *principles* survive, if consciousness be gone. We may believe, if we will, that something survives the dissolution of the body, which is capable of being put into new relations with matter, of inhabiting and using a new or a renovated body; or of being made to think and feel, and perceive external objects, and even act upon them, without any body whatever. But that it actually will be put into new relations with matter; or that it will be endued with powers, (which *now* it certainly does not possess,) of perceiving or acting on external things, or performing any process of thought, without bodily organs, we have *no* reason whatever to expect, unless upon moral or religious grounds.

The force of this conclusion will be more clearly seen, if the nature of the mutual dependency of the mind and body be attentively considered. *Neither* of the two, so far as we can discover, is capable of acting by itself. *Matter*, as has been already observed, is, by itself, inert and insensate; and so also is mind, except when matter, in peculiar forms, and in states in a great measure incomprehensible to us, is co-operating with it. It would be incorrect to consider the expressions, "mind and matter," and "mind and *body*," as equivalent. The body may be insensate, but it certainly is not *inert*. All organized matter has a certain inherent activity. Upon the ink in the glass before the writer, a greenish mould will appear, after a short exposure to the air; possessing *in itself* a power of growth and motion, apparently as much its own, as independent of the Creator, as are the minds of the highest earthly creatures, who in Him live, and move, and have their being. Nor is the human body more inert itself than is the human mind, or the mould upon the ink.

A stunning blow on the head, as has been before observed, will render the human mind as inert and insensate as the weapon that inflicted the injury. It would seem, then, that a thinking principle, or sentient principle, or living power *may* continue to exist, without the continuance of thought or sensation, or any kind of mental life, or consciousness. Of this fact most persons in health have a practical proof, every night of their lives. Language does not admit of a stronger expression, to indicate a total cessation of consciousness, than *dreamless sleep*. From such a sleep we wake, as often as it pleases the Creator, and our mental powers come back to us—whence we know not. We suppose that they existed in some mode during the interval of sleep, though we had no consciousness. "Sleep, or however a swoon," argues Dr. Butler, in his Analogy of Religion, "shows us not only that these powers exist when they are not exercised, as the passive power of motion does in inanimate matter; but shows also that they exist when there is *no present capacity of exercising them;* or that the capacities of exercising them for the present, as well as the actual exercise of them, may be suspended, and yet the powers themselves remain undestroyed." "There have been instances of madness and apoplexy, in which all the ordinary operations of the mind having been completely suspended for several years, the patients, on the recovery of their senses, have been found totally unconscious of the whole interval, and distinctly remembering and speaking of, as having happened the day before, events which occurred before the injuries; so that they could hardly be brought to believe that whole years had since elapsed."—*Archbishop Whately.*

A want of attention to this distinction between

* I think it is now too late to deny all foundation to the phrenological system. But as it is a system based upon induction, and of such a nature that very material errors of observation may be committed, without in the least invalidating the general principles, it may be unsafe to assert positively, of any particular organ, that its precise position and functions are ascertained. But those of the organs of Veneration and Conscientiousness are not considered by phrenologists as comparatively ill ascertained. If the suggestion of Dr. Mayo, in his "Pathology of the Human Mind," pp. 55, 56, should prove true, phrenology will gain both in simplicity of principles and practical certainty.

mental powers and actual consciousness, or at least an under estimate of its importance, has led many writers into error, in arguing on physical grounds for the immortality of the soul. "Whatever other effects death may have," observes Dr. Brown, "it is at least evident that when it has taken place, the bodily organs moulder away, by the influence of a decomposition more or less rapid. What was once to our eyes a human being, is a human being no more; and where the organization is as if it had never been, every feeling and thought, if states of mere organs, must be also as if they had never been. The most interesting of all questions, therefore, with respect to our hopes of immortality, is whether thought be a state of *the mere organs* which decay thus evidently before our eyes, or a state of something which our senses, that are confined to the mere organs, cannot reach; of something which, as it is beyond the reach of our senses, may therefore subsist as well, when every thing which comes under our senses, exist in any one state, as in any other state." And in a preceding passage the same great metaphysician says, "the belief of the immateriality of the sentient and thinking principle destroys the only analogy on which the supposition of the limitation of its existence to the period of our mortal life could be founded."

But though thought be a state of something which our senses cannot reach, and which survives the dissolution of the body, of what value are our hopes of immortality, if the action of the sentient and thinking principle be suspended; if, though the mental powers remain undestroyed, there be no "capacity of exercising them?" A swoon can in a moment deprive us of this capacity; sleep appears to produce the same effect; and every analogy leads us to suppose that we shall suffer a deprivation no less total, when we sleep the sleep of death. For the purposes of the argument of Bishop Butler, in his chapter of a Future Life, it was sufficient to show that we have no reason to conclude, from the dissolution of the body, that the principle by which we think and feel is necessarily destroyed. By proving that it may, and probably does subsist, all prejudice, all *a priori* objections are removed, to the probability of that future life, a belief in which natural religion dictates, and which is positively declared by revelation. In carrying his argument *beyond* this point, Butler has relied too much on a supposed independency of the *higher* powers of the mind on the body. "Human creatures," he says, "exist at present in two states of life and perception, greatly different from each other; each of which has its own peculiar laws, and its own peculiar enjoyments and sufferings. When any of our senses are affected, or appetites gratified with the objects of them, we may be said to exist, or live, in a state of sensation. When none of our senses are affected, or appetites gratified, and yet we perceive, and reason, and act, we may be said to exist, or live, in a state of reflection. Now it is *by no means certain*, that any thing which is dissolved by death is in any way necessary to the living being, in this its state of reflection, after ideas are gained. For though, from our present constitution and condition of being, our external organs of sense are necessary for conveying in ideas to our reflecting powers, as carriages and levers and scaffolds are in architecture; yet, when these ideas are brought in, we are capable of reflecting in the most intense degree, as of enjoying the greatest pleasure, and feeling the greatest pain, without any assistance from our senses; and without any at all, which we know of, from that body which will be dissolved by death." * * * "There appears so little connexion between our bodily powers of sensation, and our present powers of reflection, that there is no reason to conclude that death, which destroys the former, does so much as suspend the exercise of the latter, or interrupt our continuing to exist in the like state of reflection, which we do now." * * * "Our daily experiencing these powers to be exercised, without any assistance that we know of, from those bodies which will be dissolved by death; and our finding often, that the exercise of them is so lively to the last;—these things afford a sensible apprehension that death may not perhaps be so much as a discontinuance of the exercise of these powers, nor of the enjoyments and sufferings which it implies."

Many of the physical facts which prove the dependence of our powers of reflection upon "that body which will be dissolved by death" were unknown in the days of Bishop Butler. The indispensable necessity to our present powers of reflection of a *brain*, developed to a definite extent, and of a sufficient degree of health and soundnesss, was not then recognised. The facts, however, that every kind, or nearly every kind, of bodily affection, or injury—such as sleep, a swoon, or a stunning blow—that destroys sensation, *does equally destroy reflection;* tending as these facts certainly do, to imply a close dependency, might have led him to a different conclusion. It has since been demonstrated, that any cause which, though it may not deprive a man of his animal powers, renders his brain torpid, destroys his powers of reflection as immediately and effectually, as a disease of the retina will sometimes destroy the power of sight. It is impossible not to conclude, therefore, that our bodies are just as necessary to us, when we "live in a state of *reflection*," as when we "live in a state of *sensation*." For the continuance of this latter state after death, Butler never argues: although it is evident that sensation is not altogether a corporeal and material function, but that there must be some sentient principle besides, of the destruction of which, at death, he would be the first person to deny that there is any proof.

## LIFE IN CHRIST.

BY REV. EDWARD WHITE, ENGLAND.

"CHRIST IS MADE UNTO US REDEMPTION."

*To redeem* is to recover, or gain back again; and therefore the scriptural term "redemption" comprehends the recovery of all that we have lost in the first Adam, *holiness* and *everlasting life*, of body and soul, in paradise. It is, however, especially to be observed, that in accordance with the doctrine which represents man as essentially a compound being, having his characteristic 'image' in the *body*, the inspired writers uniformly pass over in comparative silence the happy condition of the separate spirits of the faithful, and dwell upon the *resurrection* as the true hope of the believer, the genuine and ultimate *redemption* of humanity. Whether the Apostles aim to comfort the afflicted Christian, or to stimulate the slothful, or to warn the unruly, or to strike terror into the ungodly, they derive their chief motives from the fact of our Lord's second coming in glory, and the resurrection which is so immediately connected with it. "Ye are dead," says Paul, "and your life (the life eternal of the compound humanity) is hidden with Christ in God. When Christ who is our Life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with Him in glory."—Col. iii. 2–4.

Hence the *resurrection* of Christ was contemplated

as the era of his public adoption as the Son of God. Psalm ii. 7; Acts xiii. 33.

Hence the Resurrection is denominated the Adoption, or manifestation of sonship; "waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body." Rom. viii. 23.

Hence also the resurrection is called *the regeneration*, the completion of the new birth unto holy and everlasting life. "Ye which have followed me, *in the regeneration*, when the Son of Man shall sit upon the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Matt. xix. 28.

Such is the Apostle's hope:—"That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death, *if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead.*" Such, too, his prayer for the Ephesians, that they might "know what was the hope of their calling, and what the exceeding greatness of his power to usward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places." Phil. iii. 10. Eph. i. 18.

The irresistible force of Christ's resurrection to immortal life is represented as bursting the bands of death, and carrying along with him to the heavenly regions the ransomed victims of Satan's mortal tyranny. Then only will his work be completed, when the Lord himself shall be revealed from heaven, rending those heavens with his triumphant shout of "Death is swallowed up in victory!"

That hour will surely come! The creation groans for its approach.—"*Even So, Come, Lord Jesus!*" is the Church's responsive prayer. For then will the gates of a fairer Paradise be opened than that which Adam lost, and a sublimer Eden unfold its brilliant landscapes to the enraptured gaze of God's rejoicing family. *The ransomed of the Lord shall return and come to Zion with songs, and everlasting joy upon their heads; they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away.* Isa. xxxv. 10.

We shall then bear the "image of the heavenly," and a "spiritual body" shall minister to a spiritual mind. This vile tabernacle of earth shall be exchanged for "a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." Then shall an indestructible and boundless life intensely burn in every countenance and move in every limb! The eye shall be opened to a keener insight, and to a wider survey of the immeasurable universe, and lighten with the fires of an undying intelligence! The ear shall be attuned for loftier harmonies, and strengthened to endure the reverberations of the music of celestial song! Then shall the voice pour forth the powerful languages of angels, in tones that cannot weary, and with an eloquence that never fails! Then shall the feeble sufferer, whom Satan bound for years on earth, *leap as an hart*, spring forward or "fly swiftly" with resistless force, and with a spirit which no exertions can fatigue! Then shall the glory of the Lord our God be upon us in majestic lineaments, which retain their freshness through eternal ages, and in features of awful and immortal beauty, liable to no decay: "They shall drink of the River of thy Pleasures; for at thy right hand there is fulness of joy, and *pleasure for evermore!*"

But "all these joys of the blessed," (says Jeremy Taylor, in a passage characterised by his usual quaint sublimity, and which, notwithstanding its length, we shall venture to cite in conclusion,) "both in soul and body, which are innumerable, have their source and original from that unspeakable joy of *the clear vision of* GOD. And how can the joy be less which springs from such a *Cause*, who gives himself to be possessed by man. Therefore not without great mystery it is said, 'Enter into the joy of thy Lord.' It is not said, simply, into joy; but to determine the greatness of it, it was his own joy, that joy by which he himself becomes happy. We are to consider that there is nothing in this world which hath not for its end some manner of perfection. And that those things which are capable of reason and knowledge, have, in that perfection, a particular joy and complacency; which joy is lesser or greater according as that end is more or less perfect. Since therefore the divine perfection is infinitely greater than that of all the creatures, the joy of God which is in himself (for he hath no end or perfection distinct from himself) is infinitely greater than that of all things besides. This joy out of his infinite goodness He hath been pleased to make the holy angels and blessed souls partakers of, communicating unto the just his own felicity. Therefore the joy of saints, which is that of the beautiful vision, wherein consists the joy and happiness of God, must needs be infinite and ineffable; and all the happiness and contents of this world in respect of it are bitter as aloes and wormwood. By how much a delectable object is more nearly and straitly united to the faculty, by so much greater is the joy and delight which it produces: therefore God, who is the most excellent and delightful object, being in the beatifical vision united to the soul with the most intimate union that can be in a pure creature, must necessarily cause a most inexplicable joy, incomparably greater than all the joys, real or imaginable, which can be produced by the creatures now existent or possible. For as the Divine Perfection encloseth within itself all the perfections of things created, possible or imaginable, so the joy which it causeth in the souls of the blessed, must be infinitely greater than all other joys which either have or can be caused by the creature. If there were in the world a man as wise as an angel, we should all desire to see him, as the queen of Sheba did Solomon; but if to this wisdom were joined the strength of Samson, the victories of Maccabæus, the affability of David, the friendliness of Jonathan, the liberality of the Emperor Titus, and to all this, the beauty and comeliness of Absalom; who would not love and desire to live and converse with this admirable person? Why, then, do we not love the sight of God, in whom all those perfections and graces are infinitely united, and which we ourselves, if we serve him, are to enjoy, as if they were our own?

"O how great and delightful a theatre shall it be to see God as he is, with all his infinite perfections, and the perfections of all creatures, which are eminently contained in the Deity! How admirable were that spectacle, where were represented all that are, or have been, pleasant or admirable in the world! If one were placed where he might behold the seven wonders of the world, the sumptuous banquets made by Ahasuerus, the rare shows exhibited by the Romans, the wealth of Crœsus, the Assyrian and Roman monarchs, and all these jointly together, who would not be transported with joy and wonder at so admirable a sight? But more happy was he upon whom all these were *bestowed*, together with a thousand years of life, wherein to enjoy them. Yet all these were nothing in respect of the beatifical vision of God, in whom these and all other perfections that either are or have been, or possibly can be, are contained: whatever else is great or delightful in the world, together with all the pleasure and perfections

that all the men of the world have obtained or shall obtain to the world's end; all the wisdom of Solomon, all the sciences of Plato and Aristotle, or all the strength of Aristomenes or Milo, all the beauty of Paris and Adonis; if they should give all these to one person, it would have no comparison, and would seem a loathsome thing, being compared only to the delight which will be enjoyed in seeing God to all eternity; because in Him will be seen a theatre of bliss and greatness, wherein is comprised as in one, the greatness of all creatures. In Him will be found all the riches of gold, the delightfulness of the meadows, the brightness of the sun, the pleasantness of music, the beauty of the heavens, the majesty and lustre of the stars, the contentedness of all the senses, and all that can be either admired or enjoyed.

"Let us therefore rejoice who are Christians, unto whom so great blessings are promised; let us rejoice that heaven was made for us, and let this hope banish all sadness from our hearts; let those grieve and be melancholy, who have no hope of heaven, and not we, unto whom Christ hath promised the blessedness of *His glory*. Let this hope comfort us, this joy refresh us; and let us now begin to enjoy that here, which we are ever hereafter to possess; for hope is an anticipation of joy: upon this we ought to place all our thoughts, turning our eyes from all the goods and delights of earth. From hence I will shut up the windows of the senses; the things of the world seeming unto me unworthy to be looked upon, after the contemplation of the heavenly, in which hope I only will rejoice."

And now unto Him who is able to keep us from falling, and to present us faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy, be praise and dominion for evermore. Amen.

## TRUE LITERALISM.

BY THE EDITOR.

"*Then said he unto them, O fools and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken.*"—LUKE 24: 25.

This text as translated has a harshness that does not appear in the original. The idea of *fools* in the sense now understood is not there. The Greek word *anoeetoi* signifies *unwise*, and is so translated Rom. 1: 14. There seems, however, a providence in its being translated as it is in our text; for, we know of no folly that equals that of discrediting the words of God by the prophets; and they are discredited when not received according to their most obvious import. Those words may be accommodated to other events, but in doing so must not be withdrawn from their plain and obvious meaning.

The words of the text were spoken by our Lord Jesus Christ to two of his followers after his resurrection, and while on their way to Emmaus the evening after that event. They were walking and *sad*. Jesus drew near and went with them, but their eyes were holden that they did not know him. He inquired the cause of their sorrow, and they expressed astonishment that he should be ignorant of the events which so deeply afflicted themselves. They then state the fact of the crucifixion of Jesus of Nazareth, and add, "We *trusted* that it had been he which should have *redeemed* Israel." In this expression there could have been no such idea of redeeming as is now usually attached to the term redeem, but it signifies *to liberate, to deliver* Israel. To understand then their words, we must place ourselves in their position. Israel was in bondage to the Gentile nations, or to the rulers of those nations. Israel's throne and kingdom had centuries previously been overturned, and Israel subjected to a foreign rule. But Israel had been promised a Deliverer—the Messiah. When Jesus appeared, the nation were in expectation of their Messiah; but overlooking certain prophecies which spoke plainly of his sufferings, death, and resurrection, they fixed only upon his reign and their *deliverance* from this bondage to foreign powers. This view was common to the disciples and the nation generally. Hence when Jesus was condemned by the Jews and put to death, the hope of his followers was laid in the grave, and sadness filled their hearts; and that sorrow was not dissipated by the *report* that he was risen from the dead, but their perplexity seemed to be increased. All this arose from want of a clear understanding *of* and faith *in* the things which the prophets had spoken. That which seemed to them so exceedingly improbable, or impossible, arose from lack of faith, or an implicit belief in what the prophets had said, in its most literal sense. This unbelief was the result of an inveterate prejudice against the idea of a literal death of Messiah, as is evident from the fact that when our Lord announced to his disciples that he would "be killed and raised again the third day," Peter rebuked him, saying, "Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall not be unto thee." Matt. 16: 22. They could not credit it that he meant to be understood according to the literal import of the words. The disciples, in this respect, were no more unbelieving than many now are with respect to many of the prophecies still on record, and clearly unfulfilled, unless some spiritual interpretation of them can be given, which, in our apprehension, is as wide of truth as reality is from fancy. Yet we do not condemn those who err in these matters: they may be as sincere and love Jesus as well as the sorrowful and stricken disciples did when Jesus rebuked them as in our text. They are unwise in their departure from the plain and obvious sense of the prophets, and slow of heart to believe that which shocks their prejudices or previous opinions.

Jesus goes on to say, "Ought not Christ to have *suffered* these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself." That was a wonderful sermon, and it made the hearts of these sorrowful disciples *burn within* them. Jesus concludes that sermon, the same evening at Jerusalem in the midst of all his disciples, thus: "And he said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me. Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures. And said unto them, thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day." Luke 24: 44–46. Thus forever settling the principle that the prophets are to have that interpretation which their language most plainly and obviously imports. Not to adhere to this principle is to launch forth into the wide sea of speculation where thousands have already been wrecked, and wasted their strength in fruitless efforts to save their sinking vessel.

As there is no longer a controversy as to the fact that the things which the prophets spoke concerning Messiah at his first advent had a fulfillment agreeing with the principle we are contending for, i. e. the obvious literal one, we shall now proceed to inquire

relative to other subjects of prophecy relating to Messiah and his reign. We may find men are as slow to believe the prophets now as at the first advent. The prophecies now to be considered are those which obviously have not yet had their full accomplishment relating to Messiah, as—

KING—HIS THRONE—THE PLACE OF THAT THRONE—HIS KINGDOM—HIS DOMINION—HIS ASSOCIATES—HIS SUBJECTS, &c., though they may not all be considered in this article.

PSA. 132: 11, "The Lord hath sworn in truth unto David—*he will not turn from it*—Of the fruit of thy body will I set upon *thy throne*." It is David's *seed*, then, that is to possess that throne which David occupied; and that never was in heaven above: for there David never had a throne; and Peter tells us, Acts 2: 34, "David is not ascended into the heavens." The *place* is distinctly stated in the Psa. before us, for it is added, "The Lord hath chosen *Zion*—he hath desired it for his habitation. *This* is my rest forever—*here will I dwell*, for I have desired it." He then proceeds to say what he will do there. "I will abundantly bless her provision—I will satisfy her poor with bread. I will clothe her priests with salvation; and her saints shall shout aloud for joy"—instead of *groaning* in themselves as under the gospel economy. See Rom. 8: 23. It is then added—"*There* [in Zion] will I make the horn [power] of David to bud." [Heb. *tsomakh—to grow forth, to spring up.*] "I have ordained [Heb. *orakh*—prepared] a lamp [Heb. *nair—a light*] for mine anointed." Messiah was to be God's "*prepared light.*" Accordingly, at his first advent, Simeon thus speaks of him: "A light to lighten the Gentiles *and* the glory of the people Israel." Luke 2: 32. Here is a clear New Testament testimony in which the distinction is kept up between those benefitted of the Gentiles and Israel: the latter are not a seed from among the Gentiles, but are those, many of whom were to *fall and rise again;* Luke 2: 34; so that here is no ground for seeking any other than the most obvious sense. Messiah then is yet to become "the glory" of that people. This will be done by setting up that throne which had been overturned and restoring the kingdom. That throne had been cast down as the prophets had said. In the 89th Psalm is a very peculiar prophecy relative to this matter. "I have found David my servant * * * I will set his hand in the sea, and his right hand in the rivers. He shall cry unto me, Thou art my Father, my God, and the Rock of my salvation:" a prophecy of the Psalms "concerning" Christ, and which, so far as fulfilled, has been literal. "I ascend to *my* Father and your Father, to *my* God and your God." John 20: 17. And his Father and God was the "Rock of his salvation." When he poured out his *soul* unto death, death would have held its prey, but God his Father raised him up from the dead, and thus became the rock of his salvation.

The prophecy proceeds—"I will make him my first born, higher than the kings of the earth. * * His *seed* [the children which God hath given me; see Heb. 2: 13,] will I make to endure forever, [and therefore, *they* shall be made immortal, as well as the first born] and *his throne* as the days of heaven. * * * His seed shall endure forever, [hence incorruptible and immortal] and his throne as the sun before me." But before it would be thus established it would be subverted and remain for a long time trodden under foot of Gentile governments; hence it is contained in the same Psalm, v. 44, "There hast made his glory to cease, and cast his throne down to the ground. The days of his youth hast thou shortened; thou has covered him with shame." That throne was cast down several hundred years prior to the first advent, and in the days of its youth: the throne is left desolate for a long period, not yet ended; but nevertheless God had said, "Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David:" verse 35; therefore that throne must be re-established and Messiah must sit thereon.

In confirmation of this fact, let us examine the prophet Isaiah, chap. 9: 7. Speaking of the child born—the Prince of Peace—the prophet saith, "Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end," [*where?*] "*upon* THE THRONE *of David*, and upon his kingdom to order it," [Heb. *koon*, literally, *to set firm, to establish it.* Prof. Pick, "*to re-establish it*"—Septuagint,] "and to establish it" [*to support it*—Sept.] "with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever. The zeal of the Lord of Hosts will perform this."

Here is a full confirmation of the fact that the throne of David is to be re-established, and be overturned no more: and that Jesus is the person who is to possess it, when it is again set up, Gabriel expressly affirms, Luke 1: 32, 33, when he spake of the child to be born of Mary. He said, "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his Father David. And he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." Luke 1: 32, 33. Here the heir of the throne is designated; and that he shall reign not over "spiritual Israel" merely, but over the house of *Jacob.* No chance is given here for equivocation. As if God had foreseen the attempt to remove the throne to heaven, and make the people over whom the dominion was to be exercised merely a spiritual or immortal people, Gabriel varies the form of expression from Israel to Jacob; so that the most refined spiritualiser is totally excluded from transferring the promise to another than the literal posterity of Jacob: and such spiritualisers, to be consistent, should insist upon it, that David's throne means heaven on high: but as all the prophets forbid that, and they are compelled to admit that David's throne was on Mount Zion, in Jerusalem, in Palestine, and on the earth, why not also admit that Jacob's posterity in the flesh are to constitute the citizens of the territorial kingdom under Messiah when he shall sit on that throne? If they object that this reign over the house of Jacob is *forever*, and therefore they cannot be in the flesh, we answer, that is a mere *assumption.* In the first place, if the term *forever* is taken in its primary sense, no man can prove that the probation of some of Jacob's posterity will not be continued eternally, or without end. If mere assertion would prove that point, then it may be made out; for men, parrot-like, have talked about "the *end* of probation," just as they have talked about "the *immortal soul*" till they really think it is heresy to doubt the fable. That a period will arrive to each individual at which they will become confirmed in sin or holiness, so that a reverse change will be morally impossible, we do not doubt; but that a period will ever arrive when no more of the race of Adam will be in a state of trial is what has never been demonstrated from scripture, nor do we think it ever can be; we do not affirm, however, that will not be the fact; we only say, it cannot be *proved* by the words of God or his prophets. But further, in reply to the objection under consideration. The term *forever* does not necessarily mean eternal. It is always to be interpreted by the nature of the subject. The whole of a dispensation is called everlasting. The priesthood of Aaron was

an *everlasting priesthood;* but it has passed away, or another dispensation has been opened which brought it to an end. So the reign over the house of Jacob in the flesh forever is and must be a truth, yet it may be a truth relating to a dispensation as distinct from the one which has preceded it or that may follow after it, as either of them are distinct from the Mosaic dispensation.

But that we do not mistake as to such a reign over the house of Jacob, the prophet Jeremiah shall now speak; and if we are not "slow of heart to believe *all* that the *prophets* have spoken," we think the controversy must be ended. In Jer. 3: 12 and onward, after the ten tribes had been absent from the land more than a hundred years—carried away into the north—the Prophet is bid "go and proclaim these words towards the north, and say, Return, backsliding Israel, saith the Lord * * * acknowledge thine iniquity * * * for I am married unto you: and I will take you one of a city and two of a family, and I will bring you to Zion:" [where David's throne is to be, as it once was.] "* * * * And it shall come to pass when ye be *multiplied* and *increased* in the land in *those days*, saith the Lord, * * * *at that time* shall they call *Jerusalem* THE THRONE *of the Lord;* and all the nations shall be gathered *unto it*, to the name of the Lord; *to Jerusalem*, neither shall they walk any more after the imaginations of their evil heart:" [i. e., in idolatry, and backsliding from the Lord.] Now mark what follows: "*In those days*, [when they shall call Jerusalem the throne of the Lord,] the house of *Judah* shall walk *with* the house of Israel, [the backsliding house that God said he was married to,] and *they shall come* TOGETHER *out of the land of the north to the land that I have given for an inheritance unto your fathers.*"

This text is but one of a class which can no more be mistaken as to the fact of a future return of backsliding Israel and treacherous Judah [see verses 7 and 8] to the land of Jacob, at a time which has never yet come, than the texts can be mistaken which affirm immortality through Christ to them who believe. Any attempt to set aside such texts under the pretence that they had a fulfilment at the return of Judah and Benjamin from Babylon; or that they are only conditional, and may not come to pass, or that they are to have their fulfilment in the spiritual seed alone, only shows us how justly and pertinently the words of our Lord, "O unwise and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken"—may be applied to all such persons. Their unbelief in our view, is precisely of the character of that rebuked by our Lord. We sincerely hope it may prove true that such as merit this rebuke may as soon be convinced of their error as were the disciples: our love for them makes us desire that they may be. We feel not like reviling them: we have been in time past in the same unbelief.

We now pass to a brief consideration of Zech. 14. That chapter opens with a statement that God would gather all nations against Jerusalem to battle, which results in the taking of the city, &c., "Then shall the Lord go forth and fight against those nations as when he fought in the day of battle." This description cannot answer to any past taking of Jerusalem: certainly not at its destruction by the Romans, for God fought against the city and for its captors. That this is a correct view is further evident from what follows, and that it is the literal city of Jerusalem the prophet is careful to make certain, by introducing the Mount of Olives and giving its geographical situation to Jerusalem. It is "before Jerusalem on the East:" leaving no room for a doubt that his words are to be understood in their most obvious sense. "His feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives, * * * and the Mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst, * * * and the Lord my God shall come, and all the saints [holy ones] with thee." The whole to be accomplished just as literally as the prophecies were which related to the *place* where Messiah should be born, or the *manner* of his birth, or his coming into Jerusalem riding upon a colt, the foal of an ass. How unlikely that those and kindred prophecies should have such a fulfilment as their obvious sense imports; yet strange as they were, they were fulfilled in that manner; and we are truly sorry for the slowness of heart that some good men manifest "to believe *all* the prophets have spoken."

Another fact in this chapter shows that the time is yet future and the events to be understood according to their most obvious sense. "The Lord shall be king over all the earth: *in that day* shall there be one Lord, and his name one:" verse 9. No such time has ever yet arrived: no such reign has ever yet taken place.

The prophet then describes the plagues with which the Lord will visit those who have fought against Jerusalem, which cannot be spiritualized, nor perverted from their obvious sense except by such as are "slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken." Then follows the fact that there will be "*left* of all the nations," who will be required to come "up to worship the King, the Lord of Hosts, and keep the feast of tabernacles;" and these *left* are threatened with plagues, if disobedient, showing they are persons still on trial, or in *probation*. To say these *left* are the immortal, is an unwarrantable *assumption*. What! God threaten the immortal ones with plagues! "O, unwise and slow of heart to believe all the prophets have spoken." To say, the left are the wicked, who are now to be destroyed, is to charge God foolishly. Such persons say, God calls them to come up to keep the feast of tabernacles, though he has determined to cut them all off. If they come, according to this view, they are nevertheless to be cut off, and if they refuse, it is the same! What mockery is this! We understand the words on the principle advocated in this article, according to their plain and obvious sense, and leave others, who are slow of heart to believe, to depart from it if they will. We hesitate not to say, as our conviction, it is only an apology for not believing what God has said, because *we* cannot see *how* the thing can be done; and thus think of God as if he were like ourselves. Let us beware of such a spirit.

———o———

THE BEST RECOMMENDATION.—A youth seeking employment went to one of our large cities, and on inquiring at a certain counting-room if they wished a clerk, was told that they did not. On mentioning the recommendations he had, one of which was from a highly respectable citizen, the merchant desired to see them. In turning over his carpet-bag to find his letters, a book rolled out on the floor. "What book is that?" said the merchant. "It is the Bible, sir," was the reply. "And what are you going to do with that book in New York?" The lad looked seriously into the merchant's face, and replied, "*I promised my mother I would read it every day, and I shall do it,*" and burst into tears. The merchant immediately engaged his services, and in due time he became a partner in the firm, one of the most respectable in the city.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, OCTOBER, 1851.

BEAUTIES OF IMMORTAL-SOULISM.—The following inscription is taken from a marble slab in the graveyard at Pittsfield, N. Y.

"Death is the crown of life. Were death denied, poor man would live in vain. Death wounds to cure. We fall—we rise to reign—spring from our fetters, fasten in the skies. *Life* makes the soul dependant on the dust—*Death* gives her wings to mount above the spheres. Death gives us more than was in Eden lost. *This King of Terror* is the *Prince of Peace.*"

Such blasphemy as this is worthy of the source from whence it emanates. The notion of an immortal soul in man begat and nourishes this robbery of God and his Christ. If "death is the crown of life," who puts it on our head? Answer—"*The Devil;*" for he "had the power of death." Heb. 2: 14. And as Christ is to "destroy death and him who has the power of it," (Heb. 2: 14,) it follows that Christ is to destroy "the crown of life!" But Jesus saith, "I will give thee a crown of life." But this immortal-soul theory saith, "Were death denied, poor man would live in vain!" Did Enoch and Elijah "live in vain" who were "translated that they should not see death?" Did they miss "the crown of life?" Will all such as "are alive, and remain unto the coming of the Lord," who are then to be "changed in a moment" to "immortality," and so not die, miss "the crown of life?" Have they lived "in vain?" Strange havoc does this theory make of the truth of God. But death is made the great Physician—"Death wounds to *cure!*" Death then is the healer, and the devil brings the medicine! Here is robbery of Christ and blasphemy against him! Next, "life" is blasphemed. How so? "*Life* makes the soul dependant on the dust—death gives her wings to mount above the spheres." Thus life is condemned and death glorified!

Moses saith, "I set before you life and death—choose life, that thou mayst live." But Moses, didst thou not know life makes the soul dependant on the dust, while death gives it wings? Surely, Moses, death is by far the most desirable!

The next point in the blasphemous inscription is, that "Death gives us more than was in Eden lost." Now, God gave Eden, with life and all its joys and pleasures; but informed man that he should lose it all, as a punishment, if he sinned. But Satan, (*alias* immortal-soulism,) true to his original text—"thou shalt not surely die"—still affirms the soul gains by sin; and that the death threatened brings more to man than he lost in Eden! Thus death was a blessing, and exclusion from the tree of life a reward to be coveted, as death is to give *more* than was in Eden lost!

But the blasphemy stops not here. It puts death in the place of Christ, and openly steals the peculiar title of the Son of God. Death, saith immortal-soulism, "is the *Prince of Peace!*" Truly, this blasphemous railer could go no higher. Christ came to "*destroy* death"—i. e., to destroy the Prince of Peace! The last enemy to be destroyed is death, (1 Corth. 15: 26,) but then, according to this blasphemy, the Prince of Peace is destroyed!

If such doctrine is not putting darkness for light, and calling light darkness—if it is not calling evil good and good evil, then we may defy language to tell us what is. But it is the natural and legitimate fruit of the doctrine of a natural immortal soul in man. The resurrection is of no use—is a fable—and would be a positive evil according to the sentiments here commented on. Yes, according to this theory, the work of Christ, to raise the dead and give life again, is all an evil work; and the whole scheme of redemption, or deliverance from death and corruption, is a work utterly useless and pernicious. Alas, for a theory which contemns God—deifies death, and exalts the devil, who has the power of it. Truly, immortal-soulism stands out in its genuine character as a robber of God and his Christ—as the betrayer and murderer of the Son of God, and showing its paternity—i. e., that it is of its father the devil. The only testimony in favor of the *natural* immortality of man, in the Bible, is in Gen. 3: 4, "*Ye shall not surely die.*" If that testimony is good and true, then is that theory true, and the writing on the marble slab at Pittsfield is true, and all the blasphemous assumptions therein contained must stand as truth against all the claims of Jesus Christ and redemption by him.

Our heart sickens within us whenever we contemplate the fatal and destroying delusion of immortal-soulism, and trace out its legitimate consequences. We believe many sincere souls are entangled in its meshes, and fear to allow themselves to think of the possibility that they may be in error. Time-honored error has more charms to them than care-worn, slighted and contemned truth. They fear to look truth in the face, lest they may be deceived by her. We can sympathise with them in some degree; but hope they will yet see that, to receive honor of men is the way to shut out truth and faith from their hearts. "How can ye believe that receive honor one of another?" said the beloved Saviour; and it is just as solemn a truth now as in the day he uttered it.

———o———

NORTHWESTERN TOUR.—We left home the first day of September, to attend the Tent Meeting in the city of Buffalo, N. Y., distant about five hundred and fifty miles, but a distance almost annihilated by steam and railroads. For the first time we travelled from the city of New York by the Hudson River Railroad to Albany. This road is a grand work and a most

delightful route, being alongside the noble river from which it takes it name, sometimes crossing large bays connected with the river, making one feel that he is in the midst of waters, then rushing through the rocks, which in many places bound the shores, and not unfrequently passing through a tunnel, which makes us desire less darkness, and glad to see the light again. This is an easy route to Albany. We passed over it in about six hours, near one hundred and fifty miles. Twenty-five of the road was unfinished, and that distance was by steamboat. When the road is completed, which is now done, or nearly so, the whole route will be run in little over four hours; less time than is now occupied by the railroad between this city and New York, a distance of only about ninety miles. Besides, while our railroad to New York makes us pay $3 for ninety miles, the Hudson River road demands only one dollar and ninety cents for almost twice the distance.

From Albany we travelled up the Mohawk river and valley; a very pleasant route for the most part. Passing Utica, Syracuse, Auburn, and Geneva, principal places on the way, we arrived at the city of Rochester, where we stopped with Br. Jos. Marsh for the night. With him we had an agreeable interview, as well as with several others of like precious faith of Life and Immortality through Jesus Christ alone. The next day we arrived at Buffalo. The Tent had been erected by Br. J. C. Bywater, the minister who accompanies it, and has charge of its concerns. Br. J. B. Cook was preaching to a good audience when we arrived, and the prospect was encouraging for a hearing on the great truths of the gospel of the Son of God. The first Sabbath we had three discourses; one by Br. Bywater, and two by myself. Multitudes were out to hear, and good attention was manifest, while some "*strange* things," doubtless, were brought to their ears on the way of life and immortality.

We are not of the number who think they must wear swaddling clothes, or continue babes in Christ: we believe in a growth in knowledge, without which there is no growth in grace. This may account for the state of stupor and death which is apparent with a very large portion of Christendom. They have bound themselves in chains of brass and fetters of iron—creeds and human traditions—and are quite sure there is no such thing as advance into new truths from the Bible. But as man must have advanced in some direction, many, even professors of religion, have left the sure word of God to seek light from other sources; and not a few seek unto those who have familiar spirits. The Saviour once said, "I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now:" their traditional prejudices would have been too much shocked had they known at once all that was necessary to perfect them in the things of the kingdom. But the entire revolution their minds must undergo was little more thorough than what is now necessary for most professed christians before they fully understand the gospel of the kingdom of God, and life through Jesus our Lord, so have the pure truths of the Bible been perverted by that mother of harlots and her little less corrupted daughters.

Those who set themselves to the work of advancing in the knowledge of Scripture truth may expect opposition of all sorts and from nearly all sources, but especially from lukewarm professors of religion, who are too much taken up with worldly pursuits, and looking for honor one of another, to trouble themselves with earnest, sincere, and persevering investigation of the testimony of Jesus—the Scriptures of Truth.

We mourn that these things are so, and yet we know that prophecy has clearly indicated that such would be the state of Christendom in the last days. But we are not therefore to fold our hands and put forth no effort to arouse men from this dreadful and fatal slumber. Those who have truth are under greater obligation to put forth exertion, if by any means they may rescue some from ignorance and death.

During the week after the first Sabbath, at Buffalo, we had preaching every day till Friday, when the weather suddenly changed from extreme heat and calmness to a storm of thunder, lightning, wind and rain; the first blast of which prostrated our large and beautiful canvass tent, and the rain poured through it in torrents. As the tent must be in Rochester Monday morning, it was thought best not to rear it up again at Buffalo; but a Hall was rented in which we proclaimed Life and Immortality through Christ alone, Saturday evening, and three times Sabbath day and evening. Our meeting concluded in a spirit which we think will prove a blessing to many. An interest was awakened in many minds on the questions presented at this meeting by Br. Cook, Marsh, Bywater, and myself.

*At Rochester, N. Y.*—For the want of time to write an account of this meeting, and because the following, furnished by Bro. J. B. Cook for the Advent Harbinger, is better than anything we can furnish, we give it to our readers this month.

"The great tent, under the care of Bros. Bywater and Ongley, was pitched for public worship on Washington square, September 20. The place was most convenient. The tent was commodious. It will accommodate a large congregation; and the remark of some pious ladies of good taste which I heard at our first tent meeting this year seems fully justified: 'It looks so neat, clean and *appropriate* that we could but wish the privilege of assembling in it at all times when the weather is favorable.' The tent was then new, and without spot or rent. It has been, I judge, well cared for, and well preserved; consequently, it has filled its favorable position in that beautiful por-

tion of our city admirably well. But the weather changed during the night after the tent displayed its canvass to the wind. The hot, dry and dusty streets became chilly, wet and muddy.

"Notwithstanding the chilly north-eastern rains, and the piercing winds that came blowing fresh from the lakes, the congregation has been large. The tent has been nearly filled at times. Several clergymen and distinguished citizens made their appearance in the audience; and it seems certain that not more than half or two-thirds of such congregations could have been gathered in any other place that could have been secured by us. We praise the good Lord for this opportunity of holding 'forth the *Word of Life*' to so many. Every sermon save one, during a wet afternoon, was listened to by a very considerable congregation.

"The grand themes of conversation and of public discourse, were the fundamental doctrines of Holy Scripture. The minds of the preachers were not circumscribed to the teachings of any 'father,' how honored soever, he may have been: they felt free to give utterance to any and all revealed truth that came within the range of their minds while exploring the vast fields of prophetic truth.

"*The First and Second Advents* occupied their revealed prominence. The manner of the fulfilment of prophecy at the first advent was made to illustrate the expected and impending fulfilments at the second. The grand and glorious doctrine of the Lord's coming pervaded all our services. But it was not held forth as an abstract or creed-bound idea. It was presented with its associated objects and intentions. Thus we find it revealed by prophets and apostles, and by the great teacher, Messiah himself. Thus the best and most gifted and honored of Christ's ministers preached the Second Advent for ages, after the apostles had finished their testimony. Thus the brightest luminaries of God's church *now* proclaim the coming of our Melchizedek King. See the Noels, Bickersteths, and Bonars, and McNeals, and Wolfs, Tyngs, and Newtons, and Lords, and all the more honored students of prophecy in this and other lands. Every leading pulsation of the heart of the church since the ascension of Christ has been produced, regulated, and limited more or less, by this mighty truth, in its divinely connected form. True, there has been a diversity in the verbal drapery of these lofty themes; but the essential features are the same. The Lord is coming for the accomplishment of his revealed plan. The heavens retain him 'until the times of Restitution of all things, spoken by the mouth of all the Holy prophets, since the world began.' Acts iii. 21.

"The Bible, the blessed word, was thus made the storehouse whence their thoughts were directly drawn. The preachers treated the truth of God as God's servants; and not as if they followed some pugnacious human leader, who would lash them into harness again or drive them off, whenever they did not yield to the guidance of his rein. They treated God's word as if they had to account to God.

"The impression made on the mind of the congregation seemed deep; and notwithstanding the rain and cold, the multitude evidently heard with an abiding conviction that 'the truth' was preached. They seemed to see and feel that as the state of the world demanded the 'Appearing' of our divinely appointed King; so also, the condition of each individual believing man, demands the same interposition in order to attain a future life. As the earth cannot govern itself, nor restore itself from under the curse, so mortal corruptible man has no restorative element of immortality or incorruptibility in himself. If the Lord never comes, 'the Restitution' even of believing man to happiness can never be accomplished. But with the popular theory, the dead are all in 'Paradise' or 'perdition' at death, therefore the Advent is not *essential* to their future life—not necessary to their attainment of Paradise, if worthy, nor to their *judgment* to hell, if not counted worthy. The popular philosophical theory of judgment to heaven or hell, at death, is intelligible, though unscriptural. But the two-fold absurdity of preaching a future judgment and resurrection, while both are virtually and really (though covertly) placed in the past, was brought forth against light. If the righteous are *judged* and *raised* to a Paradisaic condition as soon as they die, then no one can see or feel the necessity of a Second Advent or interposition of any kind to do the like over again. 'As for God, his work is perfect.' There is one natural life, one formation of character, and one death—'AFTER THIS the Judgment.' This judgment is essential to the bringing of the saints to our Lord's 'right hand,' as revealed. Mat. xxv. It is essential to the destruction of the wicked. 2 Thess. i. 7–9. The 'trumpet' gave a certain sound. All were made to feel that man was mortal, and that none will ever attain immortality in any sense but on the gospel plan. That is by 'Jesus and the Resurrection.'

"There were thirteen sermons delivered—three by Bro. Bywater, and ten by Bro. Storrs. These ministers were seldom, if ever, in a happier mood of mind, to present 'the truth as it is in Jesus.' The great fundamental doctrine of Holy Scripture is not the first advent by itself; nor the second. Both advents are for *the purpose* revealed. They are a means to an end, and that end is distinctly foretold. Man's creation and original position, his fall and subjection to death, his sanctification and final salvation, by the mediation of Messiah, the promised seed, is the grand and all-comprehending theme of Holy Scripture. The mediator is not the end of God's plan. The mediator of both the Old and New Testaments is employed with reference to the end—the grand pur-

pose contemplated in the mediation. The meeting has done us good. It has done good to many others, as we judge from both words and acts. Praise ye the Lord. May the divine blesssng attend our brethren through their further appointments and labors."

*At Honeoye, N. Y.*—From Rochester, we went southeast about 30 miles to Honeoye, where the tent was pitched on a most delightful spot, overlooking Honeoye Flats and Lake, with a wide prospect of beautiful "hill country" around us in all directions. A Tent Meeting was held in this place last year, and the doctrine of Immortality and Endless Life through Jesus Christ *alone* was proclaimed for the first time, by Brethren Bywater and Wendell, who travelled with the Tent together at that time. The seed which they sowed had sprung up, and much good was the result: not only were numbers, at the time, led to confess the truth, but the word of truth grew during the year. Among the number who embraced the truth after that Tent meeting, was Br. Abraham Pennell and family. He was formerly a preacher in the Protestant Methodist Connection, but had for several years past been occupying the ground of reform, the Bible the only creed, and its authority supreme. In this position the doctrine of no immortality out of Christ found him, and came upon his ears like "turning the world upside down." He nevertheless saw that it was Bible truth, and his principles compelled him, unpopular as it seemed likely to make him, to confess the truth and openly and fearlessly to defend it. At his house we made it our home during our meeting there, and seldom ever felt more *at home* when abroad, and left with regret. The whole body of believers at Honeoye, so far as we could discover, appear to be animated with primitive simplicity and hospitality, which makes a stranger feel that he is welcome among them.

Our meeting held eight days. The first four, the weather was wet and unfavorable, yet there was a good attendance, and a constant increase of interest to the end. The last evening, the congregation was larger than at any previous time, and a deep solemnity pervaded all. Truly, God was with us; blessed be his name. We never saw before so clearly the importance and utility of showing the people plainly that nothing but corruption and death is inherited from the first Adam, and that Life eternal and Immortality are only to be secured by a *union* with the second Adam; and our heart rejoiced in the blessed privilege of proclaiming these truths to those who were seeking light. Some, we know, were led for the first time in their life to see the value of life eternal, and resolved to seek it now. We felt as if we could "thank God and take courage:" yea, it seemed as if God rewarded us abundantly for all the shame and reproach we have ever borne for our advocacy of these truths.

When we were about leaving, we received the following note signed by over twenty Sisters, with a token of their good-will:

"Will Brother Storrs please to accept this slight testimonial of our gratitude for his labors here, and our esteem for himself, and love for the cause of his Master."

Their names we should be pleased to give if we did not think they would rather we should not. Accompanying this was the following most comforting and encouraging poetic effusion:

TO BROTHER STORRS.

Much in sorrow, oft in woe,
Onward, brother, onward go;
Fight the fight, though warm the strife,
Steep with tears the bread of life.

Onward, brother, onward go,
Lead in war, and face the foe;
Little now doth yet remain,
Though dark has been the long campaign.

Shrink not, brother, do not yield—
Do not quit the battle-field;
Lo! your Captain is in sight—
Fight, dear brother, ever fight.

Soon the victory will be won,
Then the Lord will say, "Well done.
Triumph in thy Master's joy,
Reign with me beneath the sky."

*Honeoye*, Oct. 8th, 1851. T. R. W.

We could not help feeling deeply under all these things, and our "heart" seemed softened into 'flesh;' so that we could scarce refrain from tears. May God abundantly reward these dear Sisters in the day of his coming. We had endeavored to water others, and truly our own heart was watered; thus the promise of God was fulfilled, and we had a fresh token of the truth and faithfulness of our covenant-keeping God, in the mercy shed on our heart through Christ our life. Oft shall we look to this event of life with gratitude, we trust, to God for the mercy so abundantly bestowed from His overflowing goodness upon us and those kind ones at Honeoye; and may they and we meet in that day when our Lord shall return in his kingdom and glory. In order to this may the Lord enable us each patiently to continue in well doing, in humble reliance on his mercy, truth, grace, and Spirit, which he will shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour, High Priest and Lord.

We preached eleven times at Honeoye, and were much worn down with that and preaching eleven times at Rochester the week previous; but we were anxious to talk all that God might enable us to do, and now are much encouraged to work for our blessed Lord and Master till he shall *return*.

We will here add, that our meeting at Rochester was one of the most comforting and profitable we had ever attended; and our interviews with Br. Cook and family, Br. Marsh and family, and others, were

exceedingly interesting and profitable. The sickness of Sister Marsh seemed the only drawback. She has been much afflicted for a long time. May the Lord sustain her and Br. Marsh in this severe trial. Trials in various forms await us all in our warfare in this state, but the sovereign remedy for sickness and death will soon come, and "our vile bodies" will be *changed* and fashioned like to Christ's "glorious body." Happy day—glorious hour to "those who love his appearing." Our afflictions are a part of the means God employs to lead us more earnestly to desire the return of our long absent Lord; though of themselves they would not produce this result; nor would a *wish* for Christ's return originating in a desire *only* to be delivered from suffering and sorrow, be evidence of a state of heart in sympathy with our Lord. To *suffer* the will of God is as important for us as enjoyment in any other way; and it is only by suffering, or trial in some form, that we come to know ourselves, and obtain that maturity of grace which shall fit us to *reign* with Christ. Not one drop of sorrow or suffering will God mingle in our cup more than he designs for our good, or more than shall result in our greater glory, if we do not prevent it by our impatience in our trials. Let us learn, then, quietly and patiently to do and *suffer* all the will of God, and trust in him at all times. Soon will the warfare be past—the sufferings ended—tears wiped away—death destroyed, and an eternal life open on our vision, with an unclouded sky, and glorious society, whose hearts will beat in unison, and no ruffle of sorrow or discord will ever more be known.

Oh! how quieting these considerations—how full of comforts—how mighty to sustain us. God sometimes *gives* us now to suffer with Christ, as well as to *believe* on his name. Let us not *refuse* the *gift*, and then we shall in due time be partners in our Lord's glory.

*At Rushville, N. Y.*—From Honeoye we went to Rushville, about twenty-five miles, where our Tent was pitched in the village, pleasantly located. Our meeting commenced on Friday evening, Oct. 16th. Bros. Bywater and Wendell opened the services to a good and attentive audience. Br. J. B. Cook, from Rochester, and ourself, arrived Saturday afternoon. In the evening, the Tent was well filled, and Br. Cook addressed the people in an interesting discourse with manifest good effect. Sabbath morning, we opened with a discourse on first principles, and the literal interpretation of God's statements of facts, promises, and threatenings. We endeavored especially to show that those who speak not according to *this word*, viz: "the law and the testimony," give evidence that they have "*no light in them.*" We trust we made it manifest that the ROOT of mysticism and fancy, in the interpretation of scripture, lay in the *assumption* that in the account of man's creation *more* is included or intended than what is expressed. The account is simple and plain. To assume that God made an immortal soul and placed it in man at his creation is to be wise above what is written, as no intimation of such a transaction is given by Moses. *Assuming* this point has led the mystical, or "orthodox," interpreters to assume also that more is intended or included in the threatening of *death* than what is expressed: thus unwittingly charging the Creator with deception—threatening *death* while he intended *misery*, or an *endless life* in torment. Such is the natural result of not speaking according to the plain and obvious import of "this word." We showed from "the law and the testimony" that the phrase "*surely die*" always and everywhere in the Bible has the meaning, and only that, of a literal death, or dissolution of man; and is never employed to signify a spiritual or moral death, or an endless life in misery—that to this fact there is not a solitary exception in the Bible, unless Gen. 2: 17 be an exception. If that is an exception, our opponents are bound to prove it so, and not *assume* it. That it is not an exception we showed from the Creator's own explanation when he called Adam to an account and rehearsed his doom—"*dust* THOU *art and unto* DUST *shalt* THOU *return.*" This is God's own definition of the phrase, "*thou shalt surely die.*" And as every other part of the "law and testimony" is in agreement with this explanation of the original threatening, we are bound to say that those who teach otherwise do so because "there *is no light in them.*" Isa. 8: 26.

In the afternoon, Br. Cook occupied the time in a very interesting discourse on Heb. 9: 27–28. The second appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, its blessed results to those who "look for him," and its benefits to this world were as largely dwelt upon as could be in one hour and an half. The assembly were manifestly instructed and interested.

In the evening, we spoke again on the subject of Immortality, taking up the arguments of our opponents, and showing that their attempted proof that man has an immortal soul by creation, or generation, is contrary to reason, and absurd, as well contradicted by the testimony of the law and the prophets, and wholly without one positive text in the Bible for its support. The deepest attention was manifest throughout our discourse, and the most intense interest seemed waked up to hear more on this subject. Never have we seen more perfect order in any place of worship than was observed during the services of this day in the Tent. The place was literally thronged: not less, we judge, than twelve hundred, and perhaps more, were in attendance. The questions examined had never before been presented in the place, and they fell upon their ears as life from the dead. The cold, formal, monotonous, and monstrous theology which has long been worn out

with use and age, began to be dissipated, and the light of life through Jesus Christ *alone* began to shine upon those who had "set in darkness, and in the region and shadow of death." We trust God gave, and will continue to give efficacy to his own truth, and make it a savour of life unto life to many who heard.

We have room only to add, this month, that the interest of this meeting kept up till the end, except it was interrupted the last day by a heavy rain. Much good we believe will be the result of that convocation.

## ARE THE WICKED IMMORTAL?

### Testimony of Paul—Or, A Seventh Sermon.

BY THE EDITOR.

If wicked men are immortal, we shall expect to find that doctrine clearly stated by such a writer and preacher as "Paul" the "Apostle of Jesus Christ." In other words, if the punishment of impenitent sinners is endless life in misery, Paul cannot be supposed to overlook it, who had constantly to preach to sinners of the worst class, and often speaks of their doom. Now, if it should appear that Paul never once gives countenance to the doctrine of the immortality of the wicked, or their conscious being in endless suffering, then it must be evident he did not believe that doctrine. Our object at this time is to examine fully what Paul did say and teach on this question; and not a text shall be omitted where he touches the subject.

In Acts 13: 40, 41, Paul utters a strong word of caution to his hearers on the danger of despising the gospel. Does he say, "Behold, ye despisers and wonder and" sink to *endless misery?* No. What then? "*Perish.*" This phrase does not mean *preserve*, under any form or circumstances, but "to decay," "to die," "to cease to have existence," "to be destroyed." Again, at verse 45, the Jews are found "contradicting and blaspheming," showing an awful state of wickedness. If Paul is a faithful servant of Jesus Christ, we shall expect him to state in the strongest and most emphatic terms the danger of such wicked conduct: but we find not a word that gives countenance to the notion that these wicked men were *immortal*, and would be tormented eternally. Just the reverse of this is clearly expressed: "Seeing ye put the word of God from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of *everlasting life*, lo, we turn to the Gentiles." What can be plainer and more forcibly expressed? It was "everlasting life" they forfeited by their sins; and that is the highest penalty of God's law, or Paul was wanting in faithfulness.

The next place where we find the apostle speaking on this subject is Rom. 1: 29–32. Let us first attend to the description he gives of the wickedness of those of whom he speaks. He says, v. 28–31, "And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient; being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant-breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful."

Can a blacker catalogue of sins be furnished than this? Surely if any men deserve unending being in undescribable torments these do. Let us hear what further the apostle has to say concerning them: "Who knowing the judgment of God, that they who commit such things are worthy" of endless torments in hell fire! Is that what they "are worthy" of, Paul? "No, I did not say any such thing." Well, what did you say? "I said they are worthy of DEATH." Is that all, Paul? Those who profess to be your "regular successors" tell us such wicked men are immortal, and cannot die, but must live eternally in misery. However, we believe you, and think those who claim to be your "successors" may not have sufficiently heeded the apostolic injunction to "beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit; after the traditions of men, after the rudiments of the [pagan] world, and not after Christ."

We now follow the apostle into Rom. 2. After showing that God's judgment of men will be impartial, both on the Jew and Gentile, he gives us to understand who will have "*immortality, eternal life,*" viz: those "who *seek for*" it, by a "patient continuance in well doing:" while the opposite character will have "indignation and wrath:" and that this will be the case with all who have sinned "without law," or "in the law;" so, that "In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ," they shall "*perish.*" In this chapter, then, the apostle gives no countenance to the theory that wicked men are *immortal*, or that any man can have immortality unless he "*seek for*" it: all others shall experience the "wrath" which they have "treasured up," under which they shall "perish" in the day of judgment. To "perish" and have "immortality, eternal life," are put in contrast by the apostle.

We next look at Rom. 6: 21–23, "What fruit had ye then in those things whereof ye are now ashamed? For the *end* of those things is "*endless torments!*" Have we read Paul right? Does he talk thus? Let us look again. "For the end of those things is *death.*" Truly! Is that all! Modern divines say it is "endless misery"—Paul says it is "death." Which shall we believe? Paul continues, "But now, being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the END EVERLASTING LIFE." He then adds, "For the wages of sin is" everlasting life in undescribable and unutter-

able torments! Is that right? Did he say so? He ought to say so, if modern theology is true. Let us take off the old sectarian spectacles and look at this text again. What did you say, Paul? I said "the wages of sin *is death.*" You did; did you? Well, we thought so; but, your words have been so often "tormented" to make them speak "endless misery," we did not know but we might be mistaken, and that death meant life. "No," cries the apostle, "The *gift* of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." Thus Paul has a perfect contrast—Death to the sinner—Life to the saint. One *dies*, and his death is eternal: the other *lives*, and his life is everlasting. Thus far Paul is clear of the heresy of endless life in misery.

Rom. 8: 13, the apostle says, "If ye live after the flesh, ye *shall die;* but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye *shall live.*" How perfectly plain. It needs no learned perverters of God's truth to make common sense men understand it. So sure as one lives, the other will die: and just as certain as life implies consciousness, death implies unconsciousness. "*To be*, or *not to be*," depends on the character men form here. If they have been made free from sin and had their fruit unto holiness, they *live* by the gift of God, eternally. If destitute of this character they die, and thus reap the wages for which they labored.

Rom. 9: 22; the apostle inquires, "What if God, willing to show his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction?" What, Paul! Are you coming out a "*Destructionist?*" Beware how you favor that class of men, "for" we "hate" them, as Ahab did Micaiah. 2 Chron. 18: 7.

Again, Paul says, Rom. 14: 15, "*Destroy* not him with thy meat for whom Christ died:" and verse 20, "For meat *destroy* not the work of God." Now, "that is provoking Paul: we called you, as Balak did Balaam, to curse our enemies, and behold thou hast blessed them altogether." "But, come I pray thee unto another place—and curse me them from thence." Very well, answers Paul, we will go to 1 Corth. 1: 18: "For the preaching of the cross is to them that" are to be *endlessly tormented* "foolishness." Will not the endless misery theorists cry out now, as did Ahab king of Israel to Micaiah, when he said with the false prophets, "Go ye up to battle, and prosper;" &c.; and the king said, "How many times shall I adjure thee that thou say nothing but the truth to me in the name of the Lord?" Very well—if truth is what you want, then I, Paul, say—"The preaching of the cross is to them that *perish* foolishness." Well, have you anything more to say? Yes, "If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God *destroy:*" 1 Corth. 3: 17. More destruction! Yes—"and through thy knowledge shall the weak brother *perish*, for whom Christ died:" 1 Corth. 8: 11. And, "if the dead rise not—then they also that have fallen asleep in Christ are *perished:*" 1 Corth. 15: 16–18. Worse and worse—truly Paul, you only prophecy evil of we immortal soulists: for, you not only teach the wicked are to be destroyed, but that the saints who die are perished if there is no resurrection, and if so they cannot be conscious now! But we are not satisfied yet, Paul; so please come with us to another place, it may be we shall make out these Destructionists heretics from there. We turn to 2 Corth. 2: 15–16, "For we are unto God a sweet savour of Christ, in them that are saved, and in them that" are *preserved in endless misery!* Have we read you right, Paul? "No—I did not say any such thing." What did you say? "In them that *perish.*" But, don't that mean *preserve?* No, for "to the one we are the savour of *death* unto DEATH; and to the other the savour of *Life* unto LIFE." But, Paul, by such testimony do you not corrupt the word of God? "No—we are not as *many* who corrupt the word of God; but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ:" v. 17.

Alas for immortal-soulists—take Paul to what place they will, he is stubbornly set in giving no countenance to their Pagan fable. Let them, however, try him to their heart's contont, and, Balak like, drag him to "another place." Gal. 6: 8, What do you see now, Paul? "He that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap *corruption*, [not immortality,] but he that soweth to the spirit, shall of the spirit reap *life everlasting.*" Phil. 1: 28, "And in nothing terrified by your adversaries: which is to them an evident token of perdition, but to you of salvation, and that of God." Also, chap. 3: 19: "Whose END IS DESTRUCTION." 1 Thes. 5: 3, "Sudden *destruction* cometh upon them, and they shall not escape." "Shall not escape" what? "Destruction." But they would escape it if eternally *preserved.* Now Paul do let us try you once more: come to "another place." Speak now, we pray thee, so as to confirm we immortal-soulists this once, for we cannot bear to think we and our fathers have been in error, and that we are not *gods.* 2 Thes. 1: 9, "Who shall be punished with everlasting" *preservation* in undescribable agonies, where "the *presence* of God in his vengeance scatters darkness and woe through the dreary regions of misery; for God is present, himself, in hell to see to the punishment of these rebels; his indignation kindles, and his incensed fury feeds the flame of their torment, while his powerful *presence* and operation maintains their being,—and rendering all their powers most acutely sensible; thus setting the keenest edge upon their pain, and making it cut most intolerably deep." Now, immortal-soulists, shout and clap your hands, for you see Paul is fairly and fully on your side! But, stop one moment: we have made a mistake. We began with Paul, but the railroad track has got so badly worn by much travel that we

run off, and took Dr. Benson's track in his "Sermons on Future Misery." Badly as we are off the of Paul, we must get back again. We start anew then: "Who shall be punished with *everlasting destruction* from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power," &c. After all, Paul differs from Benson and his immortal soul coadjutors considerably.

Again, the apostle, in speaking of the man of sin, chap. 2: 10, says his working is "with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that *perish*, because they received not the love of the truth that they migbt be saved: and for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be damned [condemned] who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." Then, Heb. 6: 8, he says, "That which beareth thorns and briars is rejected, and is nigh unto cursing; whose *end* is to be burned;" *not preserved;* for John the Baptist declares, Mat. 3: 12, that the "chaff," same as "thorns and briars," shall be "*burned up* with unquenchable fire:" no preservation, but utter destruction. Let us hear Paul once more, Heb. 10: 26–27, "For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries." "*Devour*," which signifies "*to eat up, to consume, to annihilate.*" "But we are not of them who draw back unto perdition," [*destruction,*] v. 39.

Thus closes up the testimony of Paul. We have given every word that he has spoken on the doom of the wicked, so far as recorded in the Bible. And where is one solitary expression that gives countenance to theory of the immortal-soulist? Again we ask—Where? Paul a sustainer of the God-dishonoring theory shadowed forth in the words of Benson, quoted above, which is the doctrine of all who, like Benson, believe in endless misery! No—never. Paul was not manufactured in the Pagan and Papal mill of immortal-soulism. Paganism is the *father* cause, and Papacy the *mother* cause of that worse than diabolical fable of endless torture to any being in the universe. Well did Bishop Newton say "*It is impossible for any creature to live in endless torments.*" And again he said, "God is love; and he would rather not have given life, than render that life a torment and curse to all eternity." Whatever Bishop Newton might think or say, a greater has said, even the eternal Jehovah himself, "*The soul that sinneth it shall die:*" Ezek. 18: 4, 20. Also, by the Spirit of God, the Psalmist says, "But the wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs: they shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away." Psa. 37: 20.

———o———

AN EXTRACT.—Let us establish the fact, by adducing the testimony of the Bible upon the identity existing, through the constitution of grace, between the Saviour and his people.

It is sometimes represented in scripture by the strongest expressions that human language can admit, and even compared to the union between the Father and the Son. Thus: "*Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that that they may be one as we are one: That they all may be one, as Thou, Father, art in me and I in thee, that they also may be one in us. That they may be one even as we are one: I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one.*" John xvii. 11–23.

This union is sometimes represented in Scripture by lively metaphors and resemblances. It is compared to the union of a vine and its branches. Thus, "*Abide in me and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine, no more can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the Vine, ye are the Branches. He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without me ye can no nothing.*" John xv. 4.

It is compared to the union of our meat and drink with our bodies. Thus, "*He that eateth me, even he shall live by me. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him.*" John vi. 56.

It is frequently compared to the union of the body with the head. Thus, "*But speaking the truth in love, grow up in all things into Him who is the Head, even Christ: from whom the whole body, fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body to the edifying of itself in love.*" Eph. iv. 15.

It is sometimes compared to the conjugal union. Thus, "*For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the Church. For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones.*" Eph. v. 23. "*Wherefore my brethren, ye also are become dead tr the law by the body of Christ, that ye should be married to another, even to Him who is raised from the dead, that ye should bring forth fruit unto God.*" Rom. vii. 4.

It is likewise compared to the union of a building, whereof Christ is considered as the foundation or chief corner-stone. Thus, "*To whom coming as unto a living stone, ye also, as living stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God, through Jesus Christ.*" 1 Pet. ii. 4–6.

1t is sometimes represented in scripture by an identity or sameness of spirit. Thus, "*He that is joined to the Lord is one spirit.*" 1 Cor. vi. 17.

It is sometimes represented by an identity of body. Thus, "*For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ. Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular.*" 1 Cor. xii. 27.

Such is the tenor of the inspired language upon the closeness of the relation which subsists between the exalted Redeemer and Regenerate Souls.—*Edw. White.*

———o———

THE ADVENT HARBINGER, published by Eld. Joseph Marsh, Rochester, N. Y., is an ineependent and ably conducted paper, worthy the patronage of those who do not wish to be slaves to *traditions*, and who wish to advance in divine knowledge. It is a free medium for the exchange of thought. It is a large quarto of eight pages, published *weekly* at $1 per volume of twenty-six numbers, or $2 per year. We will act as agent for said paper, and forward names and money.

AT HOME.—After an absence of more than seven weeks, we are once more at home, and hope our subscribers will excuse us that the Examiner for October has been delayed to this late period; it was *unavoidable.* The November number we intend shall be issued about the middle of that month.

The account we have given of our late tour and labor is doubtless enough, perhaps more than enough, to satisfy our readers on that subject. We have been much exposed by wet weather some of the time, and have preached more than forty times, yet the Lord has preserved us, and brought us to our family again in peace: blessed be his holy name.

Our friends whose letters and orders have not received attention, must bear with us a little, though the delay may cause them some inconvenience: we will do the best we can, and as soon as possible.

A DISCUSSION.—On our arrival home, we found an oral discussion in progress between Josiah Litch, of this city, and Thomas Read, of New York. We suppose Mr. Litch or his friends will give a *'Report'* of the debate: if they do so, we shall expose the proceedings which led to it, and the manner of conducting it, which will not be creditable to them, in our opinion.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—Our readers will remember our terms are, *payment in advance.* The next volume commences in January, and by taking a little forethought, you can just as well meet our terms then as to delay. Besides, we wish not to publish more papers than are likely to be wanted, and we cannot take subscriptions for *less time* than *one entire volume.* Let us hear from you immediately on the subject.

AN OFFER.—The present volume of the Examiner is drawing to a close, and we have some two hundred sets on hand for the year, and as many more for last year. Any person who will send us *two dollars*, shall receive perfect sets for the years 1850, 1851, and 1852. If they choose, 1849 instead of 1850, they may have it: though we can furnish only about forty sets for '49. We make this offer because we wish these papers put in circulation, and because we much need the money, and are embarrassed for the want of it. Will our friends help up in this matter?

THE CHRISTIAN TRUTH SEEKER.—It has been impossible to issue that paper regularly, as we intended. The lack of funds is the cause. We have expended more money on the four numbers published than we have received. We intend the subscribers shall not suffer loss in the end, but we must crave their patience.

REMOVAL.—We have removed our residence and office to No. 52 Vine Street, below Second, where we shall be glad to see our friends, and all who wish for such information as we are able to communicate.

THE CHURCH OF GOD, with which the editor of this paper is connected in this city, has taken *Franklin Hall*, N. Sixth Street, below Arch, for their place of public worship. Meetings held every Lord's day at the usual hours.

BR. AARON ELLIS is informed that we received his manuscript while at Buffalo; and since our return home that part also which he wishes to be inserted in place of some other matter. The pressure of labor upon us has prevented our giving the work yet an examination so as to express an opinion of it, or the probability of our being able to publish it. We have several works on hand which ought to be published, but we have no funds to do it, and those who have seem not ready to furnish the means. We intend to follow the leadings of Providence in all these matters.

THIS NUMBER of the Examiner contains the substance of two sermons preached by us in Rochester, N. Y., at the Tent meeting; and we shall, if we can find time and room, give others hereafter. Nearly all the matter for this paper was in type when we arrived at home, much of it having been forwarded to our printer during our absence. This is the apology for so large a share being occupied from our own pen.

## ACROSTICS.

BY JOSEPH LOVESEE.

### TO THE BIBLE EXAMINER.

Bold messenger of sacred truth,
I love to think—to sing of thee,
Born of God's Word, thou dos't impart
Light to an ign'rant child like me,
Enlivening all my soul.

Earth may combine her ancient lore,
Xerxes may boast his pomp and power,
And poets join in sweetest strains,
May sing of grove, plain, hill and flower,
I still will sing of thee, though weak,
Ne'er straying from the path I've took;
Each page unfolds truth new and old,
Rais'd from the depths of God's own Book.

### TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

Go forward in the work of Love,
Eternal wisdom guards thy stand,
On that broad platform—Sin is Death—
Rises salvation. Justly plann'd:
God owns the truth; its power, its might,
Egyptian darkness turns to light.

Standing on earth when Christ appears,
To hear the welcome, Come, ye blest
Of God my Father, enter in,
Rich into joys of heavenly rest—
Rest from the toils of worldly care—
Such then shall be thy happy share.

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VI. PHILADELPHIA, NOVEMBER, 1851. NO. 11

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,
At No. 52 Vine Street, below Second.
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, $1; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; always in advance.


## ELDER JOHN TATE'S DEFENCE.

It will be recollected by some of our readers that this Minister of the Gospel was arraigned before the "New England Wesleyan Conference," on the charge of preaching "*Unchristian Doctrine*" last year. Br. Tate promised to furnish us with the "*Defence*" he made at that time. It has been delayed till now. Though late, we doubt not it will be read with interest:

*Mr. President*:—In making my defence, I wish to call the attention of Conference to two points:

1. *Is my Doctrine Unchristian Doctrine?*

2. *If I am in error, are my errors of so destructive a nature as to require and justify my expulsion?*

I. Is MY DOCTRINE UNCHRISTIAN DOCTRINE?

1. We cannot determine the question by a reference to the articles of Faith in the Discipline. We have no article respecting the immortality of the soul. So far, then, if we keep within the limit of the creed, I am free from just cause of censure or expulsion. The 20th article may be supposed to have a bearing on the second specification.* Now, this I fully believe and faithfully preach, as I shall show soon. It is not, therefore, for denying any article in the Discipline of the Wesleyan Methodist Connexion that I am arraigned before you to-day. So far as the creed has any bearing on the points introduced in the specifications, so far I believe it to the very letter.

I am not charged with teaching *un-Wesleyan* doctrine, but *Unchristian* doctrine. But how shall we decide what is *unchristian* doctrine? Will you make the general opinions of the Christian world the standard in this case? Then your standard is mutable and fallible and false. You yourselves would not like to be weighed in *such* balances. In former days, general opinion denounced the best men of earth as heretics. The church doomed their bodies to the stake, and their souls to hell. Surely you will not subject me to the pain and shame of excommunication on the ground of general opinion.

There is but one way to determine whether my doctrine be, or be not, unchristian doctrine—i. e., an impartial appeal to the Bible. By that standard let me be tested—in the balances of Revelation let me be weighed. If my accuser can demonstrate the common doctrine to be true, and mine to be false, by scriptural evidence, it will then be time to inquire into the magnitude of my error, and determine my case as you may think proper.

I ask the members of the Conference to listen and judge as candidly as possible. I feel that I occupy a disadvantageous position on two grounds: 1st. Nearly all the members of Conference are fixed and decided in the belief of the popular doctrine. 2nd. Probably many have never given the subject a patient and thorough investigation. I will, however, venture to hope that you will judge me with as much candor and impartiality as the nature of the case, and the fixed state of your opinions, will admit.

I am charged with propagating unchristian doctrine, 1st., *in publicly denying that man has an immortal nature.*

This specification does not exactly express my views. I admit and maintain that all men have a nature which *can* exist forever, and that some men have a nature which *will* exist forever. What I deny is, that man is immortal *in* and *of* himself. In other words, I maintain that everlasting conscious existence will not result solely and exclusively from the nature of man. I hold that such souls as will exist forever, will be immortal, not in consequence of the nature they possess, but in consequence of the sustaining and supporting power of God. In proof of this I urge the following considerations. 1. God only hath immortality. 1 Tim. 6: 16. He only in and of his own nature, independently of all other beings, will live forever. The name Jehovah—*I am that I am*—is expressive of a fact respecting the nature of the Divine existence. God has existed from eternity; He must, therefore, exist necessarily and independently. Having thus existed from eternity, he must necessarily exist to all eternity. Now, this is what *I* call *natural* immortality. Natural immortality involves the idea of eternal and immutable existence, and as there is but one such being in the universe, that one is the *only* being who has natural immortality. The ground of man's immortality is not in the *nature* of man, but in the will of God.

2. Derived existence must forever be dependent existence. Of him, and to him, and through him, are all things. In him we live, and move, and have our being.

I think every member of the Conference will admit the proposition just stated. If there are in theology any self-evident propositions, this is one—that communicated existence can never become independent self-existence. But the doctrine that the soul is immortal in its own nature flatly contradicts this self-evident truth. It represents the soul as having the ground of its existence in itself, and thus it rashly claims for a creature of yesterday one of the infinite and incommunicable attributes of the Godhead.

For my part, I am satisfied with the scriptural doctrine, that in God we have our life and motion and being. I maintain that the *ground* of all finite existence, whether animal or intellectual, is not in the nature of the creature, but in the infinite Creator. The great creating cause of existence is the supporting cause of existence. And were the great supporting cause to suspend his preserving power in relation to any finite being, that being would perish out of conscious existence, and be no more. In his hand is the soul of every living thing, and the breath of all mankind.

I am sustained in these views by three distin-

* See Examiner for December, 1850.

guished Methodist writers. Dr. Clarke, in his note on Acts 17: 28, ("For in Him we live and move and have our being,") says: "He is the very source of our existence; the principle of life comes from Him; the principle of motion also comes from him. * * * * Without Him we not only can do nothing, but without Him we *are* nothing. *We are*, i. e., we continue to be; because of His continued present, all-pervading and supporting energy. There is a remarkable saying in Synopsis Sohar, p. 104: 'The holy blessed God never does evil to any man. He only withdraws His gracious presence from him, and then he necessarily perisheth.' This is philosophical and correct."

Speaking of the souls of men and brutes, Rev. R. Watson says: "It does not, however, follow that they are *immortal* because they are *immaterial*. The truth is, that God only hath independent immortality, because He only is self-existent, and neither human nor brute souls are of *necessity* immortal. God hath given this privilege to man, not by a necessity of nature, which would be incompatible with dependence, but by His own will and the continuance of His supporting power." [See *Institutes*, vol. I. page 179.

Again he says: "The philosophical difficulties which have presented themselves to this opinion, appear chiefly to have arisen from supposing that consciousness is an essential attribute of spirit; and the soul is naturally immortal; the former of which cannot be proved, while the latter is contradicted by scripture, which makes our immortality a gift dependent on the will of the Giver." *Institutes*, p. 363.

Rev. Luther Lee often speaks of the natural immortality of the soul—of the soul being immortal in its own nature, and maintains he has proved this point. And yet he appears to me to overturn his own doctrine. Let me place two of Mr. Lee's statements together. In the ninth article of his book on the soul, he says: "The soul is immortal in its own nature, having no tendency in itself to annihilation." And in the same article he also says: "If God should annihilate the human soul, it would require a simple withdrawal of that Almighty Power which He put forth when he created it, and which not only sustains every human soul, but the universe of both matter and mind." Now these two propositions appear to me to contradict each other. If, as Mr. Lee affirms, the soul would be annihilated were the supporting power of God withdrawn from it, then the *inherent tendency* of the soul must be to cease from existence. It requires the exercise of omnipotence every moment to keep the soul from passing away into nonentity. And yet, in direct opposition to himself, he says: "The soul is immortal in its own nature, having no tendency in itself to annihilation." A more direct contradiction than this is not conceivable by the human mind.

With Mr. Lee I maintain that the exercise of the Divine power is essential to the continued existence of the soul. His admission that the soul would cease to exist if God were to leave it to itself, necessarily involves the idea that the inherent tendency of the soul is not to exist forever, but to *die*, *perish*, and be no more. I think, then, on the ground of Mr. Lee's statement, I am authorized to pronounce the doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul a fiction and a delusion.

Were it necessary, I could multiply such testimonies to any extent. However strongly men may assert that the soul is immortal in its own nature, they believe and teach otherwise. In every theological system the *Infinite* is the creating cause and supporting power of all finite existence. My accuser may talk about the natural immortality of the soul, and whether he attaches any clear ideas to the words I cannot tell: but I feel confident that a little thinking would bring him to the conclusion that immortality is not inherent in the nature of man, but can only be secured to man by the conservation of God.

I now pass on to inquire, *Will* all men live forever? I wish to consider this question apart from any theory respecting the *mode* of future existence as far as possible, but incidental references to that point cannot well be avoided. To the question proposed I say, *No*. I will state my reasons for so answering the question.

I have been led to this by a somewhat careful study of the history of Adam. There are several points in that history which require notice. 1. I find nothing in the history that conflicts with the idea that Adam had a compound nature. The twofold nature of man is not positively asserted, nor is it positively nor by implication denied. I am led by other scriptures to believe and maintain the duality of man. But I cannot find here nor elsewhere the least intimation of the idea of immateriality. The *man*—not the mere house of clay in which the man resided—originated from dust. Gen. 2: 7, "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and *man* became a living soul." Here man is formed of the dust of the ground. The earth or the dust of the ground is a compound of many different kinds of matter, some of them of a most subtle, ethereal nature. Of these different elements God formed the *man*. But as yet there was no motion, no animation, no intelligence. The mind locked up in an inanimate structure, connected with a lifeless brain and nervous system, could not arouse itself into activity, nor awake into a state of consciousness. The mind requires *living* instruments, by means of which it can think and carry on its multifarious operations. Hence God quickened into life the man which he had formed of the dust of the ground. He breathed the vital air into his nostrils—inflated his lungs—set his heart in motion, and by these means the man who was before inanimate—the man into whom was breathed the breath of life, now became a living soul. It was not the breath which was breathed into the man, but the man into whom the breath was breathed, that became a living soul. So says the Book, and so I believe.

Here you will expect me to notice the common opinion that what was breathed into Adam was immaterial soul. I will do so. That opinion seems to me to be a mere assumption—a fiction of the imagination. I discard that notion for the following reasons:—

1st. I cannot find the least intimation in the Bible of the existence of such a thing as an immaterial soul. The notion of immateriality is not once suggested in the Book.

2. I cannot find that the words "breath of life" any where in the scriptures denote the human soul. I know the original term sometimes signifies *spirit*, but it also means *breath*—the principle of animal life. It primarily means *breath*, and this appears to me the most natural meaning of the word wherever we find the phrase breath of life. I will quote all the texts in which the words *breath of life* are found. Gen. 2: 7, "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." Gen. 6: 17, "And behold I, even I, do bring a flood of waters upon the earth, to destrow all flesh, where-

in is the breath of life, from under heaven, and every thing that is in the earth shall die." Gen. 7: 15, "And they went in unto Noah into the ark, two and two of all flesh, wherein is the breath of life." Verse 22, "All in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land died."

From these passages we see that the lower animals in common with man had the breath of life. But if the breathing into Adam's nostrils the breath of life denotes the communication of an immaterial and immortal soul, then the fact that brutes had the breath of life must imply that they also must have possessed immaterial and immortal souls. How the words *breath of life* can be explained to mean in the case of brutes, natural life—life as connected with and dependant upon breathing, and then be explained in relation to man, to mean an immaterial and immortal soul, is more than I can comprehend. Evidently, to my mind, the principle of natural life is meant both in the case of man and beasts. Other scriptures sanction this view. Ps. 104: 29, "Thou hidest thy face, they are troubled; thou takest away their breath, they die, and return to their dust." Ps. 146: 4: "His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth, in that very day his thoughts perish." Is. 2: 22, "Cease ye from man whose breath is in his nostrils, for wherein is he to be accounted of."

3. Of Adam we read that God "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life." Of men, and fowl, and cattle, and every creeping thing, we read, "all in whose nostrils was the breath of life." Now, if the breath of life meant the air we breath, I can assign a very good reason why it should be breathed into Adam's *nostrils*, and why it should be *in* the nostrils of men and beasts. But if you insist that the breath of life was an immaterial soul, I ask what reason can you assign why an immaterial soul was breathed into Adam's *nostrils?* How do you account for the fact, that the immaterial souls of men and beasts reside *in* their *nostrils?* Suppose, in speaking of the destruction of a company of men, I should say, they all perished—all in whose *nostrils* were immortal and immaterial souls! Would not that sound rather strange to you? And yet your "deathless spirits"—your immortal souls, as ye call them, are, according to the interpretation I oppose, all located in your *nostrils!* Surely, then, ye ought to take good care of your *noses.*

I cannot then believe that the breath of life which was breathed into Adam was an immaterial soul, or any other kind of soul. Adam's soul and body had been produced before, but they had not been quickened into conscious animated existence. Adam's nature existed, but Adam did not *live!* His soul could not act except by miracle, before it was acted upon; or in other words, before it could experience sensation. But when the breath of life was breathed into his body, his soul could be affected by external objects—it could feel sensation. Self-consciousness would be the result, and from that point the soul might march onward in the acquisition of higher knowledge and in the development of its various powers.

From the arguments which I have just advanced respecting the nature of Adam and the breath of life, certain conclusions follow. If my arguments are false, refute them; if you cannot refute them, then take the conclusions with them.

These conclusions are: 1st. That the human soul is not essentially conscious and active, but can exist in a totally dormant condition. 2d. That the human soul is dependant upon the living physical organization for its acquirement of self-consciousness. And 3d. That as the soul has once existed in a state of unconsciousness, so it may be reduced to a state of unconsciousness; and that, too, without the annihilation of the substance of which it is composed.

I pass on to another point in the history of Adam. I refer to the penalty threatened against transgression—"In the day thou eatest thereof, dying, thou shalt die." On this I remark, 1. That there is no reason to believe that the Hebrew verb *muth*, i. e., to die, is here used in a figurative sense. Surely in a case in which the everlasting destiny of man is concerned, God would use plain language, and not figures of speech. In the utterance of a plain fact—in the announcement of law and of penalty—we should expect words to be used in their plain and common signification, just such as we find in the ten commandments. The notion that God announced the penalty in figurative language is far from being creditable to the Law-giver. 2. It is contrary to all our ideas of the rectitude of God, to suppose that he would threaten man with a certain evil in case of transgression, and then inflict a punishment a thousand million times greater. The Law-giver who could play such a part must be sadly deficient either in intellect or conscience. But God could act no such part. He is a God of truth and without iniquity, just and right is he. 3. What then did God mean when He said dying thou shalt die? Gesenius defines *muth* as follows: 1. *To die*, spoken of the death of men or animals; both natural, Gen. 5: 8, and also violent, Deut. I3: 10. 2. *To perish, to be destroyed*, of a state, or people. Amos 2: 2.

Such is the meaning of the word. *To die, thou shalt die, shalt surely die,* are words of frequent occurrence in the Hebrew scriptures, and I confidently affirm that they never relate to endless suffering in the future state for sin. I challenge my accuser to put his finger on one passage in which the verb *muth* signifies endless existence or endless misery. It no more means eternal life in torment than it means that horses like grass, or that the earth revolves round the sun.

Dr. Clarke's note on the text is in perfect harmony with the definition of Gesenius. He says, "Literally *a death thou shalt die*, or *dying thou shalt die.* From that moment thou shalt become mortal, and shalt continue in a dying state till thou die. This we find literally accomplished; every moment of his life, man may be considered as *dying*, till soul and body are separated. Other meanings have been given of this passage, but they are in general either fanciful or incorrect."

I hold then that the penalty of the law was not immortality in misery, but literal and absolute *death.* That death would have been eternal had it not been for the plan of redemption. Apart from the merciful intervention of God, the sinner would have utterly perished and been no more. And such were the opinions of John Locke more than one hundred and fifty years ago, who was of course uninfluenced by the modern advocacy of the doctrine of everlasting destruction.

But it will be objected to me that so far as the Law-giver literally threatened the termination of life, he meant the natural life, and not the immortal of the soul. I answer: 1st. Supposing the soul of Adam was to be immortal without the plan of redemption, then the threatened penalty "dying thou shalt die" either had a direct reference to his soul in its disembodied state or it had not. If you say it had, then you are bound to prove your assertion. But I will move a step farther, and suppose that the threatened penalty *did* affect the disembodied soul of Adam.

Now keeping in mind the infinite rectitude of the Law giver, the question is *how*, HOW did the penalty affect Adam's soul? Do you require me (on pain of excommunication) to believe that the words 'dying thou shalt die,' meant thou shalt never die, but thou shalt live forever? In my judgment life and death are not only different, but they are the very opposites of each other. Whether or not the penalty had reference to the disembodied soul, the evil threatened was *death*. The moral right of the Law-giver to execute the threatened penalty is unquestioned, but I deny the right of God to punish the soul with indescribable agonies forever, after having declared that it should die. I cannot believe that when God said "dying thou shalt die, he meant thou shalt live forever in sin and sorrow; nor can I believe that he had a right to torment the sinful soul forever after threatening against it the penalty of death. Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right? But, 2d. I deny that the human soul is the subject of conscious life in its naked state of unembodiment. Before I refer to scripture testimony on this point, I wish to quote some statements from the writings of distinguished Immaterialists which have a bearing on the subject.

We have before seen that Mr. Watson says, "That the notion that consciousness is an essential attribute of spirit cannot be proved." The contrary notion is true, according to my mental experience, for I am fully satisfied that my soul has been unconscious, thousands of times since it began to exist. Mr. Isaac Taylor, in his Physical Theology of Another Life, p. 28, says: "There is reason to conjecture (perhaps a stronger term might be used) that none but the Infinite Spirit can be more than a latent essence or inert power, until compacted by some sort of restraint. The union with matter, or the coining into a corporeal state, may be in fact not a degradation to mind, but the very means of its quickening—its birth into the world of knowledge and action." On p. 23, he says, "The animal body is not itself the life, nor is it the cause of life, nor again is the spiritual body the life, nor the cause of it; but the one as well as the other are the instruments of the mind, and the *necessary* medicine of *every* specific and productive exercise of its faculties." Now you will bear in mind that Isaac Taylor is a strong defender of the immateriality and immortality of the soul. And yet he teaches in the extracts, 1st. That the union of mind with matter was necessary to its quickening—that without such union it were a latent essence or inert power. 2d. That the *continued* connection of the mind with matter, is necessary to the exercise of its faculties.

Of course, then, what he says plainly implies that the naked soul, in a state of unembodiment, would be unconscious and alike incapable of joy or suffering.

I will now call John Wesley to the stand, so that yo may hear his testimony. In his sermon on the Fall of Man, speaking of the body, he says: "It very frequently hinders the soul in its operations, and at best serves it very imperfectly. Yet the soul cannot dispense with its service, imperfect as it is, for an embodied spirit cannot form one thought but by the mediation of its bodily organs. For thinking is not, as many suppose, the act of a pure spirit, but the act of a spirit connected with a body, and playing upon a set of material keys. It cannot possibly therefore make any better music than the nature and state of its instruments allow it." Now, if, as Mr. Wesley asserts, "thinking is *not* the act of a pure spirit"—if, as he says, "an embodied spirit cannot form *one* thought but by the mediation of its bodily organs"—"if, when the organs are out of tune, the music *must* of necessity be imperfect"—then I ask *how* can the soul think with no organs at all? If thinking is not the act of a pure spirit, then when the spirit is severed from its connection with the material organization, it must be utterly incapable of thought. Thus Mr. Wesley leads me to the same conclusion as Mr. Taylor, i. e., that the embodiment of mind is essentially necessary to the exercise of its faculties. Or the conclusion may be logically stated thus:—No embodiment of the mind, no thinking; and no thinking, no consciousness; and no consciousness, no enjoyment nor suffering. Such, I think, is a fair deduction from the premises laid down by Mr. Wesley.

[To be continued.]

## THE NATURE OF MAN'S SPIRIT.

BY THOMAS READ, NEW YORK.

Some may affirm that there is a spirit in man distinct from the soul, or animal life, and that this spirit is intelligent and independent of the body, and is naturally immortal.

We think that it cannot be proved from the scriptures, and we are sure that it cannot from any other source, that man has *a* spirit apart from his temper, disposition, principles, and mental faculties, and the "*spirit of lives*," or breath. Man has the spirit of meekness, the spirit of fear, the spirit of love, and so on. It is written, God is spirit; angels are spirits; and man has spirit, not *a* spirit. The reader's mind probably reverts at once to the language of Elihu. "There is a spirit in man." But upon a closer examination, allowing that Elihu spoke conformably to the truth of God, and he may have done so, as he is not, like Job's other friends, expressly condemned, it will be found that that passage may be thus paraphrased. Job 32: 6. Elihu said, "I am *young* and ye are *very old;* wherefore I feared to show my opinion. I said *multitude of years* should teach *wisdom*. BUT I perceive there is a *spirit of wisdom* in *all* men; and the breath of the Almighty giveth to them *all understanding*. *Great men* are not always *wise;* neither do the *aged* always *understand judgment*. The spirit of God hath made me, as well as you, and the breath of the Almighty hath also given me life. Wherefore hearken to me, and *I* shall *teach you wisdom*."

We think the careful reader will readily perceive that it is a spirit of wisdom of which Elihu speaks, and that he has no idea of a spirit apart from the spirit of life, or breath. For he says, Job 34: 14, "If God set his heart upon man, if he gather unto himself his [God's] spirit and his [God's] breath, all flesh shall perish together, and MAN shall turn again into dust." Here he evidently refers to the "spirit of the breath of lives," and when this breath or spirit is taken away, the man, the whole man, returns to his dust.

But let us more closely examine the nature of the spirit that animates man. The first time the word occurs in the Bible, as indicating the spirit of man, is in Gen. 6: 3, where in the King's translation, the idea is completely lost; but we find it plainly translated in the Vulgate: "And God said, my spirit shall not remain in man forever, because he is flesh, yet his days shall be one hundred and twenty years." Which may be thus paraphrased: And God said, my "*spirit of the breath of lives*" shall not remain in man forever, because HE *is flesh*, and therefore mortal, and if I take from him my "spirit of the breath of lives,"

or his breath, he will return to his dust; yet my patience shall wait one hundred and twenty years, during which time he shall continue to breathe my spirit, until the ark be prepared to save pious Noah and his family. And thus the long-suffering of God waited, that the preaching of Noah might bring some to repentance; but when Noah was enclosed in the ark, God took away his spirit of the breath of lives from all the creatures upon the earth, and they *all perished.* As this meaning of the Vulgate is sanctioned by the Papal church, which makes the immortality of the spirit the elementary principle of her creed; and she the mother has left it as a legacy to her daughters; and as it perfectly harmonizes with the passages below, and makes a consistent sense, and as the King's translation does not make a clear sense, neither will all the orthodox allow that the Holy Spirit operates physically upon wicked men, we may fairly presume that the Vulgate is a fair version of the original, at least till the critics shall furnish us with something better.

The second time the word *spirit* occurs in relation to man is in the 17th v., where the same phrase is used in reference to all beasts as well as men. "I do bring a flood of waters upon the earth, to destroy all flesh wherein is the" [ruach chayim] *spirit of lives.* Next time in 7: 15, "And they went in unto Noah into the ark, two and two of all flesh, wherein is the" [ruach chayim, *spirit of lives.*] The phrase is again found in a more emphatic form in the 21st v., "And all flesh died that moved upon the earth, *both* of fowl, and of cattle, and of beast, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, *and* every man; all in whose *nostrils* was the [neshemet ruach chayim, *breath of the spirit of lives,*] of all that was in the dry land, *died.* And every *living* substance was *destroyed.*" If the soul or spirit was a living substance, it was destroyed or blotted out. In all these passages, there is an evident allusion to the *nephemet chayim,* breath of lives, that inflated the nostrils of Adam, and gave him life; which, with the addition of the word *ruach,* spirit, is here made the common property of all living creatures, the *universal principle of all animal life.* It was of this spirit, or breath, of which the pious Job speaks, 27: 3, "All the while my breath is in me; and the *spirit of God is in my nostrils;* my lips shall not speak wickedness." The first and second clauses of this verse are a perfect parallelism, and both alike emphatically express as long as I live. As long as he had this spirit he lived; when God resumed this spirit, he died. In Num. 16: 22, and 27: 16, Moses addresses God as the "God of the spirits of all flesh." "In God's hand is the soul [or life] of every living thing, and the breath of all mankind." Job. 12: 10, another parallelism, "If God set his heart upon man, if he gather unto himself his [God's] spirit and his breath, all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust." Job 34: 14. In Ezek. 37th c., "Come from the four winds, O breath, and breathe upon these slain that they may live. And the breath came into them and they lived." This breath or spirit is in the 14th v. called the Spirit of God. Thus we see that man's breath, or spirit, is called the breath of God, and the Spirit of God; because it is in God's hand, and under his control, and if God gathers this breath or spirit to himself, the man or the beast dies; if God reorganize the body, and put his spirit or his breath into man again, man lives.

Isa. 57: 15–16, "Thus saith the high and mighty One, &c., For I will not contend forever, neither will I be always wroth; for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls [*neshomouth*] the breath of God, which I have made."

Job 26: 4, "To whom hast thou uttered words? and whose spirit [*neshomoh,* breath of God,] came from thee?" Psa. 76, "The spirit of Princes shall be cut off." Prov. 20: 27, "The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord, searching all the inward parts." The word translated spirit is *neshomoh,* the breath of God. The universal pabulum of all animal life. The spirit of man, then, is the breath of God.

Job 34: 14, "If God set his heart upon man, if he gather unto himself his [God's] spirit, and his [God's] breath, all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust."

Eccl. 12: 5, "Man goeth to his long home * * (and) 7th v., Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." Vanity of vanities, saith the preacher; all is vanity. Is the "deathless spirit" vanity?

Ps. 146: 4, "His breath or spirit goeth forth, he returneth to *his* earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." Thoughts, [*eshtounouth*] his purposes, his resolutions, the word is nearly allied to raayounouth, desires, pursuits, purposes.

Ecc. 9: 5, "For the living know that they shall die; but the dead know not anything, neither have they (present tense) any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgoiten. Also, their love, and their hatred, and their envy is now perished; neither have they (present tense) any more a portion forever in anything that is done under the sun."

I hope the reader will pay particular attention to what follows:

Now as the words *ruach* in Hebrew, and *pneuma* in Greek, mean spirit, wind, breath, and air, we find the spirit of man and the breath of man, are precisely identical. And that the spirit of man, and the spirit of all other creatures, are precisely identical. That the words spirit and breath are used interchangably. That the same original word ruach, or pneuma, is in one version translated spirit, in another breath, in another wind. We conclude, therefore, that the spirit of man is *the universal principle of all animal life,* existing in the atmosphere, inhaled by and pervading *every living creature.* Man imbibes from the atmosphere positive electricity, which by exertion, fatigue, and cold is continually converted into negative, and as this electricity is used to produce the phenomena of life, there may be a very close connection between the spirit of man and the electricity inhaled from the air. On this at present we forbear to expatiate, preferring to rest our arguments on God's word. Let the reader remember that, as there can be no manifestation of life without the spirit, the word 'spirit' is used in a secondary sense for life, mind, temper, disposition, principles, intellectual faculties, and in a few cases for the soul of man, or person. But this spirit must not be confounded with the soul, as is too generally done. By comparison of this article with what has been said of the 'breath of lives,' and other quotations that might be adduced, there is the strongest confirmation that the spirit and the breath both in man and beast are identical. Thus it appears that the phrase 'deathless breath' would be quite as appropriate, and quite as true, as 'deathless spirit.' For though the spirit is the source of *active* life, it cannot have life of itself, neither in nor out of the man. Our spirit, mind, and disposition, are all parts of our *animal nature,* and when uninfluenced by a spirit EXTRINSIC and divine, are altogether pronounced FLESHLY and CORRUPT, and consequently *cannot be* IMMORTAL. [To be continued.]

FROM LEWIS BUTLER.

*Phelpstown*, Mich., 1851.

BR. STORRS:—I like the Examiner well. Better for the liberal spirit which it breathes than for the doctrines which it advocates; though I by no means condemn them. Nay, of the doctrine of the Destruction of the Wicked, God convinced me of the truth of it ten years ago, on this wise; I was contemplating John the Baptist's words in relation to our Lord, as found in Luke 3: 17—designing to preach from them the next Sabbath. The text naturally divided itself into the following head:

1. The floor, which I understand to represent the earth.
2. The wheat, which implied the saints.
3. The chaff, which I understand to mean the wicked.

The earth is to be cleansed, the wheat gathered into his granary, the chaff to be burned up! I was struck with surprise! Then it was to be with unquenchable fire. But what difference to me how long the fire burns, seeing the chaff is to be burned up in it! Suffice to say, that after a careful and prayerful investigation of the subject for three months, I became thoroughly convinced of the truth of the doctrine in question. I then gave publicity to my views: but I soon quailed before the mighty persecution and opposition which I had to encounter. I closed my mouth and locked up my lips, and refrained from speaking the truth on that subject for about six years. You may imagine what embarrassment I must have labored under—what leanness of soul I must have had! But, about three years since, having received help from the Lord, I commenced to proclaim the truth as far as I had learned it. And though violently opposed, there have many embraced the truth here; and the Examiners and sermons you sent me, (all of which have been scattered abroad,) have done much to inform and to embolden them in the proclamation of the truth.

The Unconscious State of the Dead, though suggested to my mind by a few texts in the old Testament, which I did not profess to understand, I had not embraced until the Examiner came to hand, or about that time. Nor have I embraced only one-half the doctrine now. For, though I believe man to be a unit, and that the penalty attached to Adam's transgression included the death of the whole man, hence in death there was no remembrance of God; and that their love, envy and thoughts perish—that the dead know not anything; yet, I believe that this state of things was only applicable to man prior to the Saviour's advent; and perhaps only thought to be so then. For the Apostle tells us that Christ abolished death and brought life and immortality to light. Now, what death was it that he abolished? Certainly not the second death, for there never would have been such a death if the Saviour had not come; nor yet is it the death of the body—for the decree that has gone forth, "From dust thou art, and to dust shalt thou return," will be literally fulfilled until the Lord comes. It must then be the spirit death, or death of the spirit. Again, what life was it that he brought to light? Certainly not a future, or resurrected life; for the Old Testament Saints believed in and wrote of that. It could be none other, then, than the continuance of the present life or immortality; at least I cannot conceive of any other. And this life he did bring to light by his gospel, as recorded by St. John, 6: 48 to 58. Our Lord here tells them that their fathers who eat manna in the wilderness are dead, (literally—not the second death.) But that whosoever eateth of the bread that he would give them should not die, but should live forever, for they had eternal life. Now, it appears plain to me that the death that he would exempt them from was the death that had passed upon their fathers, and that was a spirit-death, as well as a literal one.

I have introduced the Apostle's testimony that Christ abolished death and brought life and immortality to light by the gospel, and our Lord's declaration that he that believed in him should not die, but have eternal life. I understand you and your coadjutors to apply these texts to the second death.

Now, though I have tried to understand the scriptures in this way, (for I do not wish to be alone in everything,) I cannot; the language certainly forbids such an application. Let us suppose a case. A slaveholder overtakes one of his fugitives in a land of freedom. He promises him that if he will return with him, he will emancipate him, or tells him that the State has abolished slavery. By these representations he induces his slave to return: but when he gets to the land of slavery, he is made to understand that these promises and declarations had reference to the day of his death—that then he should no longer be held in bondage, but should be free. I ask if the slave would not have just cause to complain of fraud and deception being practised upon him? And yet, it seems to me that he who had laid hold upon the hope set before him by the Apostle in the language referred to, will have a just reason to complain if he is referred to the second death for the fulfilment of that language. But let us try another case. A criminal is examined before a court, and is condemned to be hung, but in a legal manner receives the assurance from the Governor of the State that he shall not die—shall never die. But in opposition to the language of his reprieve, he is brought to the scaffold—the preparations for the execution are going on; the criminal remonstrates, but is now told that the language of the reprieve must be interpreted so as to apply to the second death —Would not the use of all language forbid such an interpretation? And would not the sympathies of all be enlisted in behalf of him whose feelings were thus trifled with and insulted? But yet, I cannot see but that the case of the believer in Christ is equally sympathetical, and will be trifled with in like manner, if the righteous ever die. But you will doubtless inquire if the facts in the case can harmonize with the position I took, that man was created a unit, or without a separate, independent soul, or an immortal part?

Though man was created without a soul, yet he was created with capacities to acquire one, and this acquired soul may be preserved after the body is dissolved. This may be illustrated by a simple plant of vegetation. When it springs forth, it is a unit, but it soon sends forth a blossom, and then fruit, which ripens, and is capable of being plucked and preserved, though the plant be utterly destroyed which produced it.

Now, though the irrevocable decree which has gone forth, "Dust thou art and to dust shalt thou return," consigns man to dissolution, yet the soul or mind may be preserved in a conscious state. But you will probably refer me to man's anatomical constitution as an objection to this view, and tell me that organization is essentially necessary, that the functions of the mind be in exercise. To this I reply, that organization was a prerequisite to the exercise of the mind; but to say that God cannot keep the mind in exercise without organization, is to set bounds to his power. But again, in the resurrection God will change the organization, doubtless; and so

may he at death make a temporary change, so that the mind may be kept conscious till the resurrection.

REMARKS BY THE EDITOR.—While we cannot agree with Br. Butler in his views, we feel no disposition to restrict him in expressing them. In respect to the apostolic expression, that our Saviour "hath *abolished* death," &c., the original term signifies to render *null* and *void*, to *abrogate*, to *vanquish*. This our Lord did in his *own person* by an actual *resurrection* from the dead; thus giving us an example, a pattern, of the manner in which death is to be abrogated, or vanquished, in the case of his people. Christ's promise of life to his followers, four times repeated in John 6th, is, "I will raise HIM *up at the last day.*" "*Him*" means *that man;* not that man's *body*, merely; but the man *himself*. The apostle then, in the expression—"hath abolished death"—can be understood, we think, in no other sense than that Christ had personally, *for himself*, vanquished death, and thus obtained the right to deliver his people from death; but that deliverance the apostle himself did not expect till the resurrection, 'at the last trump;" for then, he saith, "shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in *victory.*" 1 Cor. 15: 54. Till then, death is not abolished or vanquished, so far as the followers of Christ are concerned; nor has he ever promised it should be: so we believe. If this is so, then Br. Butler's illustrations all fail to meet the case; for Christ's promises of life to his followers are all fulfilled to the letter, and not hypocritically, as in the supposed cases of the slaveholder, and the hangman. The "second death" is never abolished. Christ did not die to abolish that; but he did die to abolish that death which comes by Adam; not by preventing men from *dying*, but by a resurrection from it; and superadding to all that follow him, *immortality*, or a life that has no end.

As to what "the power of God" *can do*, there need be no words. The simple question is, what has he said *he will do?* Christ has never promised his disciples any reward till the *resurrection*: "Thou shalt be *recompensed at the resurrection* of the just," are his words. Luke 14: 14.

If the "righteous never die," then the righteous never can have a resurrection; for the very idea of a resurrection is that of a previous death. The expression of our Lord, John 11: 26, "Shall *never die*," must be understood in harmony with his other testimony. He had said, in the same chapter, "Lazarus *is dead:*" but though dead, it was not in the *absolute* sense; to be dead in that sense is to be dead past a resurrection—it is an eternal cessation of being. In that sense the followers of Christ shall never die. Any other view of this text is unsatisfactory and contradictory. Such we believe is the true sense of the passage, unless it was intended to express the privilege of those believers "who are alive and remain" unto the return of our Lord, "at the last day;" such will, indeed, "never die."

—o—

FROM JOHN PERKINS.

*South Braintree, Mass.*, July 14, 1851.

BR. STORRS:—I am glad to see prominent on the pages of the Examiner, the truths that "the wages of sin is death," and also the dead have no knowledge. These truths, which I think are clearly demonstrated both from the scriptures and true philosophy, through the blessing of God, I found serviceable in preserving me from some dreadful fanaticism which spread rapidly among us about the time of the end; I mean the 10th day and 7th month. I think I have read the Examiner from the first—I can say also with much satisfaction, and I hope with some profit.

I have confidence also in its editor, that he is not so given up to any theory or doctrine that he is unwilling to have it tested, and where he finds error, renounce it; and this fact gives me confidence, for I would rather see the Examiner "perish" than see it striving to receive honor of men, whoever they may be. My chief desire is, in regard to the Examiner, that Bro. Storrs may receive abundant consolation from God, whilst from pure motives and out of a sincere heart, he endeavors to publish truth.

I have recently met with a severe affliction, in the loss of a dear little boy, by drowning, on account of which my heart and also his mother's has been softened and filled with anguish. We are told afflictions spring not out of the dust. It is, however, a great consolation to know that while God knows how to sever those tender ties which he has implanted in our breasts, he does not afflict willingly, but for our good. How consoling the thought, "God is Love," and that all things work together for good to those that love him. My desire is to submit to Him, and profit by all His providences.

Yours in love.

—o—

FROM JAMES BATTERSBY.

*Saint Louis*, Aug. 24, 1851.

BRO. STORRS:—Out of the last twelve weeks I have been nine from home. I have now returned sooner than I would have done, had I not have fallen sick at Galena, Ill. I now write you from a sick room, where I have been confined the last three or four days. I am now, however, recovering. I have given away a great many books, and it is astonishing, in all parts where I go, I find some one who has heard of "Storrs' Six Sermons." I met recently in my travels with an intelligent Physician of Savannah, Ill., an obscure town on the waters of the Upper Mississippi. He has lived there ten or twelve years; yet he received and read a copy of your sermons eight or ten years since, and is a believer.

Yours in hope.

—o—

FROM DAVID CHASE.

*Bro. Storrs:*---It is fully settled in my mind that all God's words are truth, and all the positive declarations like so many cardinal points, that show us plainly what course to make. First---A kingdom represented by the stone, and all the subjects of it must resemble it by an unbending adherence to all God's truth. They must not be mixing or blending with other *kingdoms, but come out and be separate*, &c. God's *kingdom* is an everlasting one, therefore it is necessary to have everlasting life to enjoy it.

Yours in' Love.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, NOVEMBER, 1851.

"THE LOSS WHEN A SOUL IS LOST."—Such is the title of a SERMON by Prof. Charles G. Finney, of Oberlin Institute, Ohio. This discourse, we understand, substantially, has been preached by the Professor in England and in various other places. There is much in it to commend, but much also that is unsupported by proof, and has no better foundation than *fancy*. There is an effort of the imagination to picture the *horribleness* of hell which might well make its author wish his representation were only "*poetry*." It proves, however, to be bad "poetry," and worse logic, because drawn from *assumed* premises.

At the opening of his discourse, he seems aware that unless his audience will allow him to *assume* the most important point of all, he will labor in vain—hence he says:—

"Whenever ministers enter the pulpit to preach, they always take many things for granted. All do this more or less; all must do it if they would preach with any effectiveness to the heart; and it is right that they should. This is true not of the gospel minister only, but of every teacher. Every teacher assumes that his pupils exist; and that they know this truth; also that he exists himself."

The Professor's *illustration* of assumptions is certainly unfortunate. No "teacher assumes that his pupils exist," or "that he exists himself." It is no assumption at all—it is *demonstration*, to all his senses, that both he and his pupils exist. Could the Professor demonstrate in like manner that men have immortal souls, he would not need to assume it, or ask his hearers to take it for "granted." The Prof. next says:—

"This congregation professes to be Christian, and I may therefore assume that at least nominally it is so. I shall not therefore address you as a heathen people, or as atheists, or even Universalists."

This is an apology for not stopping to examine his foundation. He does not calculate his assumptions are to be questioned. But as his sermon was to be "reported" and published to the world, he might have done service to the cause of true religion to have given the proof that his premises were sound, and not have confined his thoughts to the few then before him. Some "heathen, atheist, or Universalist" might have been benefitted by the testimony brought out on so important a subject as natural immortality, if true. If any man can show it to be truth, we doubt not the Professor is the man; and we should like to see his giant mind grasp the subject; but instead of that he very coolly proceeds as follows:—

"There are certain great truths admitted by almost all Christians; for example, *that the soul is immortal.* This is admitted so generally, that I shall assume that you all admit it. You admit it to be true of both the righteous and the wicked. You admit that the Bible teaches this, and I shall not therefore attempt to prove it."

This is truly cool. Happy for him that he did not "attempt" the proof. Especially, that he did not attempt to prove it from the Bible. He might *torture* that book to make it testify to such an *assumption*, but he can never make that volume of truth *affirm* any such doctrine. The only *positive* testimony to his asssumption found in the whole Bible is in Gen. 3: 4, "*Ye shall not surely die.*" If the *witness* is credible, then we admit the proof of man's natural immortality, or the immortality of man's soul, is proved. But before "admitting" this testimony, we must *assume* that both God and his Christ are *untrue*: for God testifies, "The *soul* that sinneth IT *shall die.*" Ezek. 18: 4, 20; and Christ Jesus our Lord testifies of the witness, Gen. 3: 4, "When he speaketh *a lie*, he speaketh of his own; for he is a liar, and the father of it." John 8: 44. We do not "assume" that his testimony is false—we prove it; and from the mouth of God and his Christ. Let Prof. Finney prove as conclusively that the soul is immortal, and he shall never have occasion to insinuate again that we are "heathen, or atheists" because we de not believe in the dogma of an immortal soul in man.

The Prof. having assumed his premises, and assumed also that all whom he addressed "admitted" them without controversy, proceeds in his description of the "*eternal progression*" of the soul in knowledge and capacity for enjoyment or suffering. So far as this relates to the righteous, on whom God will bestow immortality at the resurrection we do not know but he is right, and incline to that view: we see not how it can be otherwise; and yet we should prefer that he would give us some plain "thus saith the Lord" rather than trust it wholly to human testimony, as he has done. When, however, he turns from the righteous to contemplate "the progress of the wicked," the proof that they possess immortality is lacking, and hence he launches into the regions of *fancy* without chart or compass, and no wonder he should wish it were all "poetry." We give our readers the following specimen of his flight. He says:—

"Now see also the progress of the wicked. They too are moving onward. The law of progress cannot be arrested by any amount of sinning. Onward still their minds are progressing: more and capacious for knowledge and of course for sin and suffering. And O! What then! What follows from these established laws of the human mind and of human existence! Let your reflections trace out the fearful results which accrue from these laws of eternal progression. When we get into the midst of these things, the mind becomes exhausted and overpowered; it sinks down and cries out with crushing emotion—O what an eternity is this for the sinner—lost forever! O look upon that sinner after he has passed along through millions of ages of his unceasing pro-

gress in knowledge and in growing capacities for sin and suffering. Hear him. He says, Hell knew but little of sin and suffering when I came here, compared with what I suffer now! They all then sinned and suffered but little, even taken in the vast aggregate, compared with what I sin and suffer in my own single being now! Alas, I seem to have all hell in my own bosom! I sin and suffer enough with my vastly augmented powers to make an awful hell even if these agonies were equally distributed among myriads of my fellow beings. How awful! Sin, misery and ruin enough to make one awful hell, locked up in the agonized bosom of a single sinner. If this were only poetry, I should be glad, but all is true, and so much more is true that no language can express it; no modes of computation and no forms of estimate can reach its appalling magnitude. So much is true that to see the thousandth part of it must set your soul all on fire!"

Truly, this is *poetic* enough, and purely *fiction*, without any other basis than fancy. If the *assumed* premises were *proved*, then the conclusion might be true: but as that is not done, *faith* can never receive the conclusion—*credulity* only receives it for truth, and that credulity is nourished by *superstition*.

We will give one more flight of the Professor's fancy. He adds:—

"Take any sinner here—any young man or woman from this congregation. Follow him onward from this hour through a life of sinning, a death of darkness and horror, and then onward still as he rolls in the agonies of the second death and moves onward age after age in the unceasing progress of a human mind expanding its intelligence, learning more and more of the God the sinner hates, and only hating Him forever the more, and only making himself the more immeasurably wretched by sinning with bitterer hate, and suffering with still enlarged capacities as the eternal years roll on! O young man! you will one day be able to say—All that hell knew of suffering before I came here is nothing compared with what I now suffer! All is nothing to the aggregate of my sins and of my sufferings. And all I now endure is only a beginning. My miseries have only begun. This soul of mine has only begun to know how to suffer the real sufferings of the damned. Its keen sensitiveness to agony has only begun to develope itself. Yet at some period in the flow of those endless years of progression in sorrow, each one will say—If all the universe at the moment of my death, had taxed their minds to the utmost to conceive the guilt and miseries that wring my heart, they could not even have begun to reach the appalling estimate! Would to God this were only poetry! Alas, that it should be among the best established truths in the universe of realities! Young man, there is no axiom in mathematics more true than this."

If all this is so "true," and is the revealed will of God, the Professor is himself a probable subject for the horrors he describes; for he manifests an irreconciliation to God's purpose that such should be the doom of the sinner, in the solemn wish that it *"were only poetry."*

The Professor, after saying some good things on the *"danger of losing the soul,"* makes the following remark:—

"If all these countless dangers were seen in their real magnitude, and especially if they were seen in their bearings upon the loss of a soul, methinks it would rouse all mankind into excitement almost to madness in securing the salvation of their souls. How could they refrain from crying out in the very streets and within the very walls of their bedchambers—What shall I do to be saved from such a hell!"

*"Such a hell!"* Yes, such a presentation of hell, or of the purpose of God as to men who die unpardoned, is well calculated to drive "into excitement" *quite* "to madness" if it was only believed; but the Professor gives evidence that neither himself nor the "orthodox" generally really believe a word he has said of *"such a hell."* Hear him! He says:—

"The entire orthodox world admit the truths upon which we started, and admit substantially those other truths which are necessarily connected with them. Now it is most astounding that these truths should be dropped out of mind—their bearings forgotten, and all their relations be overlooked as if they had no value, as if they were indeed only fictions and not facts. They are forgotten by parents, so that few indeed think of the bearings of these truths upon their children's well-being for eternity; they are forgotten by husbands and by wives, so that in these relations of life little is said, little felt, little done, for each other's salvation. In fact these great truths have come to be less regarded than almost any one of the ten thousand things of this world. The least of these worldly matters is practically treated as of more value than the soul. Must there not be a strange delirium upon the human mind?"

Here is a confession which it would seem might be enough to open the Professor's eyes to the fact, that while "the orthodox world" *profess* to believe there is *"such* a hell," their profession is mere *hypocricy!* They have no faith in it—it is *"only fiction*, and not fact." Truly, there is *"a strange delirium* upon" his own mind to proclaim such "fiction" with the means before him, in the Bible, for *proving* its falsity. And then, out of his own mouth he is convicted of unbelief in the existence of "such a hell;" for he says:—

"If all these countless dangers were seen in their real magnitude, and especially if they were seen in their bearings upon the loss of a soul, methinks it would rouse all mankind into excitement almost to madness in securing the salvation of their souls. How could they refrain from crying out in the very streets and within the very walls of their bedchambers—What shall I do to be saved from such a hell?"

Now, is Prof. Finney *"aroused* into excitement almost to madness?" And does he "cry out in the very streets" to save these "immortal souls" from *"such a hell?"* Is he not bound to love his neighbor as himself? And if men should be thus aroused with excitement almost to madness, and cry out in the streets to know what they must do to be saved from *such a hell*, is he not bound to show the same excitement for others, and cry out to them in the very streets to escape from such a hell? Let Prof. Finney satisfy the community *practically* that he believes what he preaches about "such a hell," and then we doubt not his preaching will be more effectual to arouse others as he intimates he desires they should

be. Till then, we leave *his* hell among "poetry and fiction."

The sermon which has occasioned these remarks we never saw till at Honeoye recently, where we found it in the "Oberlin Evangelist," at the house of our friend and brother, Abraham Pennell, who wrote to the Evangelist, making some inquiries of its editor immediately after its appearance last July. That letter received no attention, and Br. Pennell has consented to allow us to insert it in the Bible Examiner:—

ABRAHAM PENNELL'S LETTER.

*Mr. Editor:*—I have read a sermon in the Evangelist of the 2d of July, preached by Professor Finney, and reported by the editor, the title of which is, "*The Loss when a Soul is Lost.*" On this sermon I wish to say a few words. And I do not do so by way of complaint or fault-finding, neither do I wish at present to controvert the main doctrines of the sermon, or even to review them. What I do desire, and greatly desire, is, that the assumed doctrine of the *immortality of the soul* should be *proved*, and proved by at least one positive declaration of scripture. If this cannot be done, the assumption goes for just what it is worth; which is just as much as any other baseless assumption is good for, without any sanction or support from the scriptures.

The assumption that the soul is immortal lays the foundation for another, which is, that the mind in its capacities both of intellect and sensibility, will be "always increasing." And when these assumptions are made or admitted, the conclusion which is drawn from the premises in the sermon inevitably follow. Then we have the increased happiness of the righteous, and augmented misery of the wicked to all eternity.

But if these assumptions are false, then the conclusions are; for the conclusion cannot be any better than the premises. Now, I am among many who doubt the truthfulness both of the premises and the conclusions, for the very simple and plain reason that I cannot find any such doctrines in the Bible. And Mr. Finney himself seems to regret that the Bible justifies his premises; for he twice repeats his wish that this was "only poetry." But, he adds, "alas! that it should be among the best established truths in the universe of realities."

I presume Mr. Finney will not blame me for believing all this is poetry, if he does not see proper to prove, as before requested, that it is true. Truth is what we want—is what we need—is what the world needs. Heathen dogmas have long enough prevailed. Christian theology has long enough been mutilated and corrupted. The Bible has long enough been misconstrued and falsely interpreted. Oh! that we could see its beauties and glories—see that immortality and eternal life are the gift of God through Jesus Christ, and not by Adam. But I am forgetting myself. I only want the proof of the assumptions in the sermon, or else say the Bible does not teach the doctrine, only as it is inferred, and for that inference the inspired writers are not responsible.

I hope if you or Mr. Finney should attempt the desired proof, it will be published in the Evangelist, as I want to see the proof made as public as the sermon.

Yours in love of the truth,

A. PENNELL.

*Honeoye, N. Y.*, July 24, 1851.

THE DEBATE.—In the late debate between Josiah Litch and Thomas Read, in this city, there was an evident attempt to evade the direct question at issue, and to prevent Br. Read from proceeding in a direct course of argument. The old theme was harped upon, by Mr. Litch, of the "*blasphemy*" of the idea that "*God*, the maker and upholder of all things, was three days in a state of *unconsciousness!*" He knows that none of his opponents hold any such sentiments; yet he introduces it, with all the eloquence and pathos he is master of, to excite the prejudices of a part of the audience against our views. Br. Read very handsomely rebuked him, by informing him that "God gave *His Son* to die:" and that "the Apostle Paul lays it down as a first principle *to be believed*, that *Christ died:*" 1 Cor. 15: 2, 3; and that by the belief of it we "*are saved,*" &c.

The true question at issue was, "*Is extinction of being or endless torment the wages of sin?*" Mr. Litch attempted to sustain the latter; and as he led in the debate, he took what course he chose in starting; the first point of which was, to establish the idea that man is *three-fold*—that is, in addition to the man formed of the dust of the ground, God formed a soul and a spirit in the dust man; and thus, as he openly avowed, instead of man being a *unit*, he was made up of "*three men.*" To sustain this position, he brought forward Zech. 12: 1, "The Lord * * * *formeth* the *spirit* of man within him." On this text hung the strength of his entire argument. To prove from such a text that there is a distinct entity, or *real being*, formed in man, so constituted as to make *a man* proper, was the Herculean task he undertook. He might as well undertake to prove *four* men as three; for the Apostle saith to the Galatians, chap. 4: 19, "I travail in birth again until Christ be *formed* in you." Does Mr. Litch suppose that Christ is actually formed [created] in each believer? If, so he will have more Christ's than "three;" yea, as many as there are believers; so that his Christ instead of being "*one* Lord Jesus Christ" would be '*legion.*' The manifest sense of the Apostle is, that the mind, disposition, temper, &c., of Christ should be formed in them.

The text Zech. 12: 1, has as rational an exposition, without resorting to the the preposterous assumption that *another man* was formed within man, in addition to the man of whose creation the Mosaic account is clear and distinct; and which gives no countenance to the idea of a *trinity* in man.

The term translated *spirit*, Zech. 12: 1, is *ruahh*, or more properly *rooakh*. In this last reading we follow Prof. Pick. If Josiah will turn to Prov. 29: 11, he will find the same word translated "*mind:*" "A fool utter ethall his *mind, rooakh,* but a wise man keepeth *it* till afterwards." Does a fool *utter—yotso, bring out*—all his "*third* person" when he speaks? Again, God saith, Hab. 1: 11, of the Chaldean—

"Then shall his mind—*rooakh*—change." Did the Chaldean's "*third* person" change?

We might multiply instances of a similar use of the term upon which he relies to prove that the *rooakh* in man is a *real being;* but there are sufficient to show how desperate is the case he has in hand. God formed man an *intelligent* being, with mind—a mind of an higher order than other animals. To assume that that mind—*rooakh*—is a distinct entity, and so constituted as to make a *third* man, which may live and act altogether independent of the other "two" men, or only in connection with the second, or *soul* man, is preposterous in the highest degree, in our judgment. Not one particle of evidence has he in the Mosaic account of man's creation to give weight to his assumption; and the fact that he has to go down more than a thousand years later than Moses, and fix upon an isolated text, having an incidental expression, which may seem, at first view, to countenance his position, but in reality does not, shows how vain is the attempt to make out his "*three* men," or his *man trinity*—"*a trinity with a vengeance,*" as Br. Read remarked in reply. Having attempted to prove from Zech. 12: 1, that the *rooakh* in man is a distinct entity, or *being*, he resorts to 1 Peter 4: 5–6, for proof that the spirit exists separate from the body. His argument stands thus:—

"The spirits of men do retain their identity and consciousness after death. Peter says, referring to sinners, 1 Pet. iv. 5–6, 'Who shall give account to him who is ready to judge the quick and the dead. For this cause was the gospel preached to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit.' The doctrine of this text is, that those who are dead, had the gospel preached to them during their day of probation, and are thus, although now dead, the subjects of judgment or trial. That although dead as men, they live according to, or in the same manner as, God *in spirit.* In that spiritual form, they will be judged in the same manner as men in the flesh. We regard this as an incontrovertible evidence of the existence in consciousness, of the spirits of men after death."

His reliance upon this text, to prove the consciousness of the spirits of dead men, shows how difficult it is to prove the theory he advocates: a text confessedly, by nearly all commentators, of difficult explication, but of all doubtful interpretations, his is one of the most so. If it be the true one, it follows that men to whom the gospel has not been preached will *not* "live in the same manner as God in *spirit*," that is, in a separate state from the body: for, the apostle says, "For *this cause* was the gospel preached to them that are dead, that they * * * *might live* according to God in the spirit." If that means that they might live in the *same manner* as God in spirit, *i. e.* in a separate state of consciousness, then, if the gospel had not been preached to them, they would not so live; and, of course, that spiritual existence *is not* and *was not* in themselves, but is an *effect* from a "*cause,*" viz: "the gospel;" and so they who have not had the gospel preached to them will not so live whatever others do; and this is "incontrovertible evidence" that "the spirits of men after death" are *not* "in consciousness" from any inherent principle, as his *theory* maintains. The text from Peter, then, is clearly against him. The Roman Catholics claim this text to prove their purgatory; and the Restorationists to prove their theory; and either of them have quite as good claim to it as he has to prove his; all three are in error, and their claims without foundation. As to the real meaning of the text we may speak at another time; it is sufficient now that it is shown not to warrant the construction he puts upon it. That construction contradicts the plain and positive testimony of the Bible, viz: "In death there is no remembrance of thee; in sheol who shall give thee thanks." Psa. 6: 5, "The dead praise not the Lord." Psa. 115: 17. "There is *no knowledge* in sheol," the state of the dead. Eccl. 9: 10. "The dead know not anything." Eccl. 9: 5. "Sheol cannot praise thee, * * * they that go down to the pit cannot hope for the truth." Isa. 38: 18.

Here is *positive* testimony, all of which, and much more, condemns Mr. Litch's *assumption* of the meaning of 1 Peter 4: 5–6.

Mr. Litch continued to keep off from the main question till the third evening of the debate. He then plunged, the first dash, into the book of Revelation, and seized the *devil* to begin with. It was a master-stroke of policy; and he expatiated with great pathos on the "*eternity of eternities,*" which he said the devil had got to be tormented. "For ever and ever —*aionas ton aionon,*" he said, means "*eternity of eternities.*" After having exhausted his pathetic vocabulary on the devil, he fell back on Rev. 14, and presented the worshippers of the beast in "*eternity of eternities* of torment," and went off in a blaze of solemn warning to those who taught otherwise.

Br. Read, however, with one single quotation, *annihilated* all the "eternity of eternities" that his opponent had manufactured, and put him to silence. The text was from Mr. Litch's own chosen book, Rev. 5: 13, "And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I, saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever." He charged home upon his opponent that his "eternity of eternities" must have come to an end; and that he must take one or other horn of the dilemma, viz: the devil and all wicked men were destroyed out of being, or else converted. Did Josiah meet this home-thrust? No, he was silent; and the next evening tried to shift the subject back to the intermediate state, where he had figured the two first evenings; so he started off

with "*necromancy*" for the fourth and last night of the debate. But this time his attempt to decoy Br. Read from the true issue was a failure; and though his first fifteen minutes ended while he was in the midst of his necromancy argument, and he promised to resume it, he was thrown off his track and did not get balanced again for the evening, and was manifestly in *a labor* where his strength had become weakness. Among other remarkable exploits he attempted to tell what the soul is; and his opponent must have pitied him in the embarrassment he manifested. The soul "is not matter," and "it is not exactly immaterial;" and he tried to get out some idea of it by various motions of his head and arms, and doubtless gave as definite a notion of a soul as he or any of like faith can do; which is just none at all, except with those who take the shaking of one's head and arms for sense and reason.

———o———

"ETERNITY OF ETERNITIES" is the period of the torment of the wicked, saith Josiah Litch; and in proof of this position brings forward Rev. 14: 9–11, a text which an intelligent man should blush to produce in proof of the punishment of wicked men at all, beyond judgments inflicted in this present life. In order to make this text available to our opponents, they must prove *three things*. *First*—That it is spoken of ALL wicked men. *Second*—That it relates to their punishment beyond this life. And, *Third*—That the term "for ever and ever" is used in its primary and absolute sense of *endless*. Neither of these points have they ever proved, and never can. It is not enough for a man to get up and swing his arms and shake his head and *affirm* all these points: let them *be proved*. We say again, it never has been done and never can be.

1. *Is this language used in reference to all wicked men?*

We answer, *no*. It is a specified class, viz; "If any man worship the *beast* and *his image*, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand." This is the *class* spoken of and threatened; and it comes almost infinitely short of embracing *all* the wicked. The beast and his image (see chap. 13: 17) is not in existence till a late period of the Christian era. The dynasty of rulers symbolised by this beast and his image are of late origin, if yet in existence; hence it is impossible that more than a small portion of the race of Adam can come under the threatening of ch. 14. This fact alone shows the absurdity of our opposers quoting it in support of their theory, which is, that *all* wicked men will be involved in endless torment.

2. *Does the judgment threatened in Rev.* 14: 9–11, *relate to wicked men beyond this life?*

We unhesitatingly say *no*. The following chapters prove this. The 15th chapter opens thus—"I saw another sign in heaven * * * seven angels having the seven *last* plagues; for in them is *filled up* the wrath of God." The original is, "In them was completed the wrath of God."

Mark well, these plagues are *the last* on somebody; and they are to have a *completion;* hence it is impossible that they can be eternal, or *endless*. Now observe, verses 7 and 8, it is said, "One of the four vital beings gave unto the seven angels seven golden vials full of the wrath of God," &c. "And the temple was filled with smoke from the glory of God, and from his power; and *no man* was able to enter into the temple, *till* the seven plagues of the seven angels *were fulfilled," or completed.*

Let it be distinctly noted, these plagues are THE LAST, and that they COMPLETE *the wrath of God* on the power to be visited; and *also* that NO MAN can enter into the *temple of God* till they are COMPLETED. Now what follows—If these plagues, or any part of them, fall on the wicked spoken of in chap. 14: 9–11, then either no man ever can enter the temple of God, or the wrath spoken of will have been completed, or finished. Now listen—"I heard a great voice out of the temple, saying to the seven angels, Go your ways, and pour out the vials of the wrath of God [*where*] UPON THE EARTH:" not in hell, nor the moon, nor any other fancy location. "And the first went and poured out his vial *upon the earth.*" Well, what happened? And there fell a *noisome and grievous sore* upon *the men* which had THE MARK OF THE BEAST, and upon them which WORSHIPPED HIS IMAGE."

Here is the commencement of the exact fulfillment of the threatening in chap. 14. *There* we find the *threatening; here* the wrath in a course of *accomplishment*, and it has not missed the persons threatened. These plagues are *all* to fall on the earth: chap. 16: 1; they are the "filling up of the wrath of God"—and they are "*the last:*" and till they are filled up and completed, no man can enter the temple of God: then what becomes of "*the eternity of eternities*" of their torment? It has passed away, like other *fancies of mere theorists.*

As we have shown that the threatened wrath in Rev. 14: 9–11, is to be "upon the earth," and that it must have a *completion*, or no man can ever enter the "*temple in heaven,*" it is unnecessary to spend time to prove that the term, forever and ever, in the text, is used, as often elsewhere, to signify no more than a protracted period, without defining its exact length. We might greatly extend our remarks on this subject; but we trust we have said enough to convince all candid inquirers, and more would not avail with bigots, and dealers in mere assumptions. Let the reader examine the fourth and fifth plagues.

———o———

ETERNAL PUNISHMENT, *Destruction and not Endless Torture.*—In the late debate, Josiah Litch insisted that everlasting destruction is not extinction of being; for those "punished with everlasting destruc-

tion," of whom Paul speaks, 2 Thess. 1, are *destroyed* AT Christ's second advent, and must therefore have a resurrection at the end of the thousand years; and hence could not have become extinct when destroyed: so he reasons.

Here, as usual with our opponents, is *assumption* enough to satisfy mere theorists, but it falls far short of convincing a thinking man. Mr. Litch affirms the last verses of Matt. 25 relate to the final judgment, and that the words, "There shall go away into everlasting punishment," relate to the final doom of the wicked, and mean endless torment.

Now, whatever *scene* is described Matt. 25, and whatever *time* is there spoken of, the same, in both respects, Paul speaks of 2 Thess. 1. If one is at the coming of Christ, so is the other. If the wicked are to have a resurrection in the one case, so are they in the other. If the punishment is not final in one case, then it is not in the other. Let the chapters be compared togother. They are both laid in one scene. "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with him." Matt. 25: 31. "When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels." 2 Thess. 1: 7. Is here any mistake? The scene is *one, and the same;* and no cunning can separate them. "These shall go away into everlasting punishment." Matt. 25: 46. "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction." 2 Thess. 1: 9. Now, Mr. Sophistry, separate *the time* and *the events*, if you can. Deny that one is *final* and you deny that the other is final! Say, there is a resurrection after the punishment in the one case and it follows that there is in the other; and so proves the punishment Matt. 25: 46 is not the final one! And then what becomes of your *endless torment*, which you attempt to fix on the language of that text? Vanished, like all other *fancies* of immortal-soulists.

———o———

DEATH DEFINED *by Josiah Litch.*—He said, in the debate, "Death is the separation of the soul and spirit from the body." That is, according to his theory, one man dies and two live separated from the dead one. Then the penalty of the divine law in Adam's case, and in all who die by Adam's sin, is *fully inflicted* the moment the union of the *trinity* in man is dissolved. Hence as two of the men do not cease to live, and have passed through the penalty of the law, that law has no further claim on them, and so cannot inflict any further pain or penalty unless they sin in their new state, and under some law not made known to us. No wonder the "*spirit-rappers*" testify all men gain by dying! However, as we are satisfied the "*spirit-rappers*" are great liars, so we are equally satisfied that Josiah's definition of death is unscriptural and untrue. We choose to adhere to God's own definition, which is, that *the man* is dust, "dust *thou* art, and *unto* DUST shalt *thou* return," saith the Maker of man; and we judge He knew as well as those who would be "wise above what is written." Nothing short of dissolving *the man* could be death; and that dissolution must be to his original elements; and so God declares it should be; and so we believe it is. But, saith Josiah, if that is so, "a resurrection is *impossible.*" Just so thought the Sadducees; and our Lord rebuked them for their *ignorance* of 'the Scriptures,' and 'the power of God.'

———o———

A SYNOPSIS.—After the foregoing articles, on points taken up in the late debate, were in the hands of our compositor, we had handed us the following synopsis, by one who heard the whole debate:

"In the discussion between Josiah Litch and Thos. Read, the question was, 'Do the Scriptures teach that the wicked will have an eternal conscious existence in torment?" Mr. Litch's chief effort seemed to be to endeavor to establish the separate identity of both soul and spirit, particularly of the spirit, and that both can and do exist in a conscious state, while the man, in his body, is dead; and hence, death, destruction, ceasing to be, &c., must be interpreted differently from their plain and obvious imports, and the wicked, having immortal souls and spirits, would live forever in torment. He dwelt particularly upon Eccl. 12: 7, Zech. 12: 1, 1 Cor. 6: 17, 1 Pet. 4: 6, and Rev. 14: 11; and adduced the laws against Necromancy and Demonology, and the recent 'Spiritual Manifestations,' as proofs positive that man is conscious in death.

"On the other hand, Thomas Read proved that man is a unit—that he is a soul, not *has* a soul, and that man has no abstract soul or spirit that can possibly be conscious apart from himself or his body. He proved that man, as to his whole being, in the original scriptures, was generally called *odom*, a man of dust, or *enoush*, mortal—that men were called *anosheem*, mortals, without any qualification, more than two hundred times. He proved that the soul was declared to be mortal, dying, and dead, several times. That the spirit of man is a part of the universal principle of all animal life, in the hands of God, and when it is "resumed by God," "returns to God," "is blown out," "put out," "cut off," &c.; then the man necessarily returns to his dust and is unconscious. In other words, though the spirit of man is the cause of life, yet it has no life in itself, and the words mortal and immortal, or living, or dying, are never applied to it. Therefore, all those numerous expressions, implying the utter extermination of the wicked, must be understood in their plain and obvious import, as implying the utter extinction of their being. Thomas Read likewise put forth several propositions, either of which, being true, proved that the wicked would *not* have an eternal conscious existence, all of which were left untouched by Josiah Litch."

## SCRIPTURE EXPOSITION.

BY THE EDITOR.

Forasmuch then as Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind: for he that hath suffered in the flesh, hath ceased from sin. That he no longer should live the rest of his time in the flesh to the lusts of men, but to the will of God.—1 PETER, IV., 1 & 2.

Here is a conclusion the Apostle comes to, from what he had previously taught in chapters two and three, which teaching was, that Christians should carefully avoid evil doing, and practice well doing; and if they suffer let it be for well doing; and in the manner and spirit that Christ suffered; carefully copying after his "*example.*" As Christ suffered for us—on our account—while in the flesh—that he might overcome evil with good, and bring us to reconciliation to God; "arm yourselves"—equip yourselves—"likewise with the same mind"—*ennoian*—idea, thought, purpose, intention. "For"—*oti*—seeing that, or because—"he that hath *suffered*—*pathon*—having undergone or suffered the last extremity—"in the flesh"—in the corruptible state, and having learned of Christ how to suffer—"hath ceased"—*pepautai*—left off, refrained—"from sin"—*amartias*—sinful propensity; "that"—so that, or wherefore—"he no longer"—no more—"should live the rest"—remainder—"of his time in the flesh"—this mortal state—"to the *lusts* of men"—or, after the irregular or violent desires of men—"but to the *will* of God"—or, the *purpose* of God: that is, after the "example" of Christ.

For the time past of our life may suffice us to have wrought the will of the Gentiles, when we walked in lasciviousness, lusts, excess of wine, revellings, banquetings, and abominable idolatries. Wherein they think it strange that ye run not with them to the same excess of riot, speaking evil of you: Who shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead.—3, 4 & 5.

"For"—truly—"the time past of our life may suffice"—has been sufficient—"to have wrought"—performed—"the will"—purpose, desire—"of the Gentiles, when we walked in"—went after—"lasciviousness"—injurious behaviour—"lusts"—irregular desires—"excess of wine"—heated with wine—"revellings"—nightly revellings with songs—"banquetings"—drinking about, or "drinking round"—"and abominable idolatries, wherein they"—who still practice such things—"think it strange"—surprising—"that ye run not"—not at all—"with them to the same excess of riot"—dissoluteness—"speaking evil of you"—blaspheming you, i. e., speaking against you—"who shall give account to him that is ready"—in readiness—"to judge"—to separate—"the quick"—the living"—"and the dead." This last expression may relate simply to the moral state, as it is said, "You hath he *quickened* who were *dead* in trespasses and sins." The expression, "*is ready* to judge," seems to imply something to be done not thousands of years after, but soon, and the following verses may confirm this view.

For, for this cause was the gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit.—6.

Wherefore on this account "was the gospel"—the good news of *life*—"proclaimed also to them that are dead"—literally, or morally; probably the latter—"that they might be judged"—separated; or led to see what their state is—"according to men in the flesh"—or, fleshly men; that is, men living after the flesh, or animal nature—"but live according to God in the spirit:" that is, *live spiritually.* We paraphrase this subject thus: "Some men are still dead in sins, and some have been quickenod, or made alive to God: the proclamation of *life* was made to those that are dead in sins, that by it they might learn their true state while living after the flesh, and so be lead to God that they might partake of spiritual life."

But the end of all things is at hand: be ye therefore sober, and watch unto prayer.—7.

The "all things" to which Peter refers, it is not, perhaps, so easy to decide. The expression is not an absolute one; though, if applied to the Jewish institutions and polity, we shall not be at a loss to give it a very absolute application. And, with present light, we cannot but think that is what was in the Apostle's mind. He was the Apostle of the circumcission, or to the Jews: many of them had been converted to the faith of Jesus, and were now "strangers scattered abroad," and narrowly watched by their enemies, as the preceding chapters show. The time was drawing nigh when the whole civil and ecclesiastical polity of the Jewish nation was to be uprooted, their city destroyed, and they scattered among all nations. These events actually took place in a very few years after this Epistle was written. As such tremendous events were nigh "at hand," and the prophecy of them was well known and proclaimed wherever the gospel was preached, it was important to exhort and charge Jewish converts, in particular, that they should live in reference to those events, both that they might escape those judgments, and that such as had hitherto neglected the gospel might be led to acknowledge Jesus as indeed the prophet of God when the complete and entire overthrow of "all things" pertaining to them should so exactly be fulfilled before their eyes, as Christ had declared. Though that, we believe, is the true application of this verse, it is especially applicable to us who live in the end of the Gentile *age;* when fearful destruction is to fall upon Gentile powers and governments preparatory to the kingdoms of this world becoming the kingdom of our God and his Christ, now even at the door: so that the language of the verse sounds in our ears with greater power than in the days of the Apostle; for, if

God did fully accomplish all that he threatened against Judah and Jerusalem, shall he not be as true to his word against Gentile nations who have corrupted the gospel, and whose rulers have not ruled in the fear of God? The prophecy is equally clear that the Gentile nations at the end of the time of the dispersion of the Jews, and prior to the reign of Christ, are to be visited with terrible judgments, such as would break up all the long-established governments and cause men's hearts to fail them with fear. At this point of time we are living; and the end of all these time-honored institutions, that have grown grey in oppressing men civilly and ecclesiastically, is at hand. Let us therefore "be sober"—in a sound mind; sober-minded—"and watch"—be vigilant—"unto prayer"—seeking aid, direction, support, and comfort from God: without which, in these perilous times we shall be ensnared and perish.

And above all things have fervent charity among yourselves; for charity covereth the multitude of sins. Use hospitality one to another without grudging. As every man hath received the gift, even so minister the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God.—8, 9 & 10.

Fervent charity, or love, is above, or before all things, the most important among Christians; it is not only the mark of a disciple of Christ, but "the charity shall cover"---i. e., *prevent, cause not to exist* ---"the multitude of sins." He then exhorts, "Use hospitality"---kindness to strangers---"one to another without grudging"---murmuring, grumbling, complaint. "As every man hath received the gift" ---*charisma*---free gift, or benefit, whether temporal or spiritual--"so let him minister"---distribute---"the same one to another, as good stewards"—one to whom anything is entrusted for the benefit of others, a manager, an agent---"of the manifold grace"---many favors--"of God."

———o———

From Matthew Batchelor.

*Pownal, Vt.*

*Bro. Storrs:*—I cannot see how we can separate the doctrine of the destruction of the wicked from the unconsciousness of the saints until the resurrection. To me they are united. If man is a living soul, when he dies, the man, the whole man, is dead, and ceases to praise the Lord. He must have a resurrection in order to live and praise the Lord, according to Isaiah 38: 18–19; and Psalm 6: 5.

Again, according to Paul's statement, 1 Cor. 15th, if there is no resurrection, they that have fallen asleep in Christ are perished: which could not be if all the intellectual part of man was already in the presence of God, where there is fulness of joy. Then as the first death is death in all its parts, the Spirit that animated the man, the whole man, having returned to God who gave it, man returns to dust as he was. Psa. 146: 4; Eccl. 12: 7; Job 34: 14–15. Here we learn what the second death is. It is not dying and never die; and God burning a part of himself in hell to all eternity! No, no, that which belongs to God returns to God, and man goes back where he was before he was created. Ob. 16th v.

But some say, if we preach the unconscious state of saints, it will keep men from looking at the destruction of the sinner. What have we to do with that? Is it true? If so, it is my duty to preach it, and leave the result with the Author of truth. What is the chaff to the wheat, saith the Lord. We used to be told not to preach the destruction of the wicked, for they will not be alarmed at mere death—as though making out God to be a retaliatory being would lead man to repentance, forcing eternal existence upon man, and torturing it to all eternity, for no other end than to show (as some say) the glory of his justice and power; and yet, with emphasis, say *God is Love!* Who could believe the two if they dared to look at it as it is. God is Love; and God in his love will let the sinner die if he will not have life through God's lovely plan. A sense of this will lead men to repent. I am yours in love for all the truth.

———o———

From Edward T. Welch.

*Ocean Port, N. J*

As I was seeking for an Examiner this evening, my hand fell on a pamphlet. When I opened it, I found it to be J. Litch's Pneumatologist, in which on page 283 of the May number, the writer endeavors to prove the spirit of Man *immortal;* yea, he affirmed to his combatant in the Dialogue that he has proved the same. His proof, as he quoted, is found in St. Peter's 1st Epistle, 3: 3, 4. "Whose adorning," &c.

If the text proves the immortality of the soul, that spirit must be an ornament to adorn; and such must be a meek and quiet one, otherwise it would not be of value in the sight of God. If this ornament is an immortal spirit, there are two things to be considered. 1. That few are ornamented with an *immortal spirit.* 2. It would prove conclusively that man does not naturally possess *immortality*! This is truly a queer way to prove that *man's spirit is immortal.* It is, however, as good as is usually brought by the adherents of that theory. I have not time further to consider the above quotation, but suggest it for your consideration.

There is one blessed promise, yea, many that assure us that the righteous shall have Life—will put on *Immortality*---be made incorruptible, at the coming or our Lord Jesus Christ, the bestower of such unspeakable blessings. No wonder that the Apostle Peter burst forth in such strains of rapture as this: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to his abundant mercy, has begotten us again to a lively hope *by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead to an inheritance,*" &c.

SCOTLAND.—In a note from Bro. Moncrieff, sending us six subscribers to the Examiner, he says:—"It gives me pleasure to tell you that my health is greatly restored. I am able to walk now, and find walking becoming easier to me every week. Much reason have I to praise the Lord. As far I can judge, the cause of LIFE and LOVE advances. I hear of good done by our works often. And when souls are brought to love God, and to regard Jesus as the resurrection and the life, we ought to shout for joy. Let us hold on; and when the Lord comes, we will enter on the heavenly rest, and receive the gracious reward which the Lord hath promised to them who continue faithful in his service."

Br. Moncrieff will accept our thanks for his interest in the Examiner.

———o———

ILLNESS.—Since our last paper was sent out, we have been unable to do much by reason of affliction. After our seven weeks absence and labor, we came home needing rest, instead of which, for two weeks, we had incessant toil in preaching, attending the debate, furnishing matter for the Examiner, reading proof, mailing papers, and all our domestic affairs, our family having removed in our absence, making us additional labor for a time. Altogether, we were well nigh prostrated, and had to desist entirely from all exertion, finding our strength weakness, brought on by excess of labor and care.

———o———

"BIBLE TRUTH."—The poetic effusion under this caption, in the Examiner for March last, was sent us without a signature; we said "from an unknown person!" We had no suspicion it was an *Acrostic;* nor did we see it till our attention was called to it in our late tour; when, sure enough, there was the name of one of our most constant hearers. The lines are so good we will let our readers turn back and read them again, and they will see who is the author, his residence, and the time when written.

———o———

BOUND EXAMINERS.—The next Examiner completes the present volume. We shall then have the numbers for 1850 and 1851 bound in *one* volume. The price will be $1.50. To paying subscribers for 1852, we will put it at $1.25.

We can still furnish a few bound for '48 and '49 in one volume. Price for that, in all cases, $1,50.

Those who wish for these works should send us their orders soon, and inform us how they will have them sent, or whether we shall lay them aside till called for. This we cannot promise to do unless they are paid for

———o———

"BIBLE EXAMINER—EXTRA."—We have published a new edition of this work, containing the Six Sermons, in quarto form, with Bishop Whately on the "*Second Death.*" We have removed the History of Immortal-Soulism, and introduced a page of new matter, a considerable portion of which is an article on Bishop Newton's view of the 'Final State of Man,' in which he strongly favors Restorationism from the false notion that the soul is *immortal*, and he cannot believe in *endless misery*. These efforts of such minds as Newton's show that the notion of *eternal torture* is destined to take its place among the *superstitions* of the barbarous ages. We rejoice that such blasphemy is likely to have an end, and that the God of justice and love is not always to be maligned by it.

Price of the new edition, *five cents* single copy. By the hundred $2.50.

———o———

BIBLE EXAMINER.—Our readers will remember our terms are, *payment in advance.* The next volume commences in January, and by taking a little forethought, you can just as well meet our terms then as to delay, Besides, we wish not to publish more papers than are likely to be wanted, and we cannot take subscriptions for *less time* than *one entire volume.* Let us hear from you immediately on the subject.

———o———

AN OFFER.—The present volume of the Exrminer is drawing to a close, and we have some two hundred sets on hand for the year, and as many more for last year. Any person who will send us *two dollars*, shall receive perfect sets for the years 1850, 1851, and 1852. If they choose 1849 instead of 1850, they may have it: though we can furnish only about forty sets for '49. We make this offer because we wish these papers put in circulation, and because we much need the money, and are embarrassed for the want of it. Will our friends help us in this matter?

———o———

STORRS' MISCELLANY.—We have added to this work "*The True Source of Life,*" and shall hereafter sell it at 50 cents: which is as low as it can be afforded. It now contains 140 pages neatly bound in muslin.

———o———

THE ADVENT HARBINGER, published by Eld. Joseph Marsh, Rochester, N. Y., is an independent and ably conducted paper, worthy the patronage of those who do not wish to be slaves to *traditions*, and who wish to advance in divine knowledge. It is a free medium for the exchange of thought. It is a large quarto of eight pages, published *weekly* at $1 per volume of twenty-six numbers, or $2 per year. We will act as agent for said paper, and forward names and money.

———o———

THE CHURCH OF GOD, with which the editor of this paper is connected in this city, has taken *Franklin Hall*, N. Sixth street, below Arch, for their place of public worship. Meetings held every Lord's day at the usual hours.

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VI. PHILADELPHIA, DECEMBER, 1851. NO. 12.

GEORGE STORRS, Editor and Publisher.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,
At No. 52 Vine Street, below Second.
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, $1; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; always in advance.

## ENDLESS MISERY.

We copy the following from "*The Life and Correspondence of John Foster*," Baptist Minister, England. We give it place in the Examiner, not because we endorse all that he says, but to show the struggle of a powerful and pious mind to extricate itself from the horrible doctrine of Eternal Misery. Had he not held the corrupting doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul, he would not have been led to lean so strong to the doctrine of Restorationism: but endless misery he could not believe. He confesses he has "*not directed much thought to*" the doctrine of the "*literal* interpretation of the threatened *destruction*" of the wicked. Had he done so, he might have been saved much labor in arriving at the truth on the end of the wicked.

The editor of the work, J. E. Ryland, in the Preface says:—

"On one point only of dogmatic theology, Mr. Foster dissented from the religious community with which he was most intimately connected. Allusions to this subject (the Duration of Future Punishment) occur in two or three passages of his early correspondence; but it is discussed at some length in a letter to a young minister, written in 1841, (vol. ii., p. 262). Without offering an opinion on "the moral argument," which to a mind of so high an order carried irresistible force, or inquiring what exceptions may be taken to those views of mankind and the present life to which it may appear that that argument owes much of its cogency—and while those who differ from him, and not a few, probably, who would assent to his views, may regret that the statements of scripture are not more fully discussed—it may be permitted, in justice to his memory, to remark, that in Mr. Foster's mind, as is evident from his other writings, this belief was associated with the holiest views of the Divine being, and with a most elevated standard of moral excellence; nor among those who deem him mistaken on this subject, could any one be found who would more earnestly deprecate that a theological speculation should occupy the thoughts to the neglect of practical, personal piety."

Here follows the letter spoken of. Let it be read and pondered well. We commend it especially to all Baptists and Baptist Ministers: and we rejoice to know that many of that denomination have their minds exercised with serious reflections like Mr. Foster:

## TO A YOUNG CLERGYMAN.

*In answer to one in which he stated his inquiries and difficulties on the subject of the eternity of future punishments.*

September 24, 1841.

Dear Sir:—If you could have been apprised how much less research I have made into what has been written on the subject of your letter than you appear to have done, you would have had little expectation of assistance in deciding your judgment. I have perhaps been too content to let an opinion (or impression) admitted in early life dispense with protracted inquiry and various reading. The general, not very far short of universal, judgment of divines in affirmation of the doctrine of eternal punishment must be acknowledged a weighty consideration. It is a very fair question, is it likely that so many thousands of able, learned, benevolent, and pious men should all have been in error? And the language of scripture is formidably strong; so strong that it must be an argument of extreme cogency that would authorize a limited interpretation.

Nevertheless, I acknowledge myself *not* convinced of the orthodox doctrine. If asked *why* not, I should have little to say in the way of criticism, of implications found or sought in what may be called incidental expressions of scripture, or of the passages dubiously cited in favor of final, universal restitution. It is the moral argument, as it may be named, that presses irresistibly on my mind—that which comes in the stupendous idea of eternity.

It appears to me that the teachers and believers of the orthodox doctrine hardly ever make an earnest, strenuous effort to form a conception of eternity; or rather a conception somewhat of the nature of a faint, incipient approximation. Because it is confessedly beyond the compass of thought it is suffered to go without an attempt at thinking of it. They utter the term in the easy currency of language; have a vague and transitory idea of something obscurely vast, and do not labor to place and detain the mind in intense protracted contemplation, seeking all expedients for expanding and aggravating the awful import of such a word. Though every mode of illustration is feeble and impotent, one would surely think there would be an insuppressible impulse to send forth the thoughts to the utmost possible reach into the immensity—when it is an immensity into which our own most essential interests are infinitely extended. Truly it *is* very strange that even religious minds can keep so quietly aloof from the amazing, the overwhelming contemplation of what they have the destiny and the near prospect of entering upon.

Expedients of illustration of what eternity is *not*, supply the best attainable means of assisting remotely toward a glimmering apprehension of what it *is*. All that is within human capacity is to imagine the vastest measures of time, and to look to the termination of these as only touching the mere commencement of eternity.

For example: it has been suggested to imagine the number of particles, atoms, contained in this globe, and suppose them one by one annihilated, each in a

thousand years, till all were gone; but just as well say a million, or a million of millions of years or ages, it is all the same as against infinite duration.

Extend the thought of such a process to our whole mundane system, and finally to the whole material universle: it is still the same. Or, imagine a series of numerical figures, in close order, extended to a line of such length that it would encircle the globe, like the equator—or that would run along with the earth's orbit round the sun—or with the outermost planet, Uranus—or that it would draw a circle of which the radius should be from the earth or sun to Sirius—or that should encompass the entire material universe, which, as being material, cannot be infinite. The most stupendous of these measure of *time* would have an end; and would, when completed, be still *nothing to eternity.*

Now think of an infliction of misery protracted through such a period, and at the end of it being only *commencing*—not one smallest step nearer a conclusion:—the case just the same if that sum of figures were multiplied by itself. And then think of *man*—his nature, his situation, the circumstances of his brief sojourn and trial on earth. Far be it from us to make light of the demerit of sin, and to remonstrate with the supreme Judge against a severe chastisement, of whatever moral nature we may regard the infliction to be. But still, what is man? He comes into the world with a nature fatally corrupt, and powerfully tending to actual evil. He comes among a crowd of temptations adapted to his innate evil propensities. He grows up (incomparably the greater proportion of the race) in great ignorance; his judgment weak, and under numberless beguilements into error; while his passions and appetites are strong; his conscience unequally matched against their power:—in the majority of men, but feebly and rudely constituted. The influence of whatever good instructions he may receive is counteracted by a combination of opposite influences almost constantly acting on him. He is essentially and inevitably unapt to be powerfully acted on by what is invisible and future. In addition to all which, there is the intervention and activity of the great tempter and destroyer. In short, his condition is such that there is no hope of him, but from a direct, special operation on him of what we denominate grace. *Is* it not so? *Are* we not convinced—*is* it not the plain doctrine of scripture—*is* there not irresistible evidence from a view of the actual condition of the human world—that no man can become good, in the Christian sense, can become fit for a holy and happy place hereafter, but by this operation *ab extra?* But this is arbitrary and discriminative on the part of the sovereign Agent, and independent of the will of man. And how awfully evident is it, that this indispensable operation takes place only on a comparatively small proportion of the collective race!

Now this creature, thus constituted and circumstanced, passes a few fleeting years on earth, a short sinful course; in which he does often what, notwithstanding his ignorance and ill-disciplined judgment and conscience, he knows to be wrong, and neglects what he knows to be his duty; and consequently, for a greater or less measure of guilt, widely different in different offenders, deserves punishment. But endless punishment! hopeless misery, through a duration to which the enormous terms above imagined, will be absolutely nothing! I acknowledge my inability (I would say it reverently) to admit this belief, together with a belief in the divine goodness—the belief that "God is love," that his tender mercies are over all his works. Goodness, benevolence, charity, as ascribed in supreme perfection to him, cannot mean a quality foreign to all human conceptions of goodness; it must be something analogous in principle to what himself has defined and required as goodness in his moral creatures, that, in adoring the divine goodness, we may not be worshipping an "unknown God." But if so, how would all our ideas be confounded, while contemplating him bringing, of his own sovereign will, a race of creatures into existence, in such a condition that they certainly will and must---*must*, by their nature and circumstances, go wrong, and be miserable unless prevented by especial grace, which is the privilege of only a small proportion of them, and at the same time affixing on their delinquency a doom of which it is infinitely beyond the highest archangel's faculty to apprehend a thousandth part of the horrer.

It must be in deep humility that we venture to apply to the measures of the divine government, the rules indispensable to the equity of human administration. Yet we may advert to the principle in human legislation, that the man tempted to crime should, as far as is possible without actual experience, be apprised of the nature and measure of the penal consequence. It should be something the main force of which can be placed in intelligible *opposition*, so to speak, to the temptation. If it be something totally out of the scope of his faculties to apprehend, to realize to his mind, that *threatened something is unknown*, has not its appropriate fitness to deter him. There is, or may be, in it what would be of mighty force to deter him if *he could have a competent notion of it;* but his necessary ignorance precludes from him that salutary force. Is he not thus taken at a fearful disadvantage? As a motive to deter him, the threatened penalty can only be in the proportion to his (in the present case) narrow faculty of apprehending it; but as an evil to be suffered it surpasses in magnitude every intellect but the Omniscient. Might we not imagine the reflection of one of the condemned delinquents suffering on, and still interminably on, through a thousand or a million of ages, to be expressed in some such manner as this:—Oh! if it had been possible for me to conceive but the most diminutive part of the weight and horror of this doom, every temptation to sin would have been enough to strike me dead with terror; I should have shrunk from it with the most violent recoil.

A common argument has been that sin is an *infinite evil*, that is, of infinite demerit, as an offence against an infinite Being; and that since a finite creature cannot suffer infinitely *in measure*, he must *in duration.* But surely, in all reason, the limited and in the present instance *diminutive nature of the criminal* must be an essential part of the case for judgment. Every act must, for one of its proportions, be measured by the nature and condition of the agent. And it would seem that one principle in that rule of proportion should be, that the offending agent should be capable of being aware of the magnitude (the *amount*, if we might use such a word) of the offence he commits, by being capable of something like an adequate conception of the being against whom it is committed. A perverse child committing an offence against a great monarch, of whose dignity it *had some*, but a vastly inadequate, apprehension, would not be punished in the same manner as an offender of high endowments and responsibility, and fully aware of the dignity of the personage offended. The one would justly be sharply chastised; the other might as justly be condemned to death. In the present case, the offender does or may

know that the Being offended against is of awful majesty; and therefore the offence is one of great aggravation, and he will justly be punished with great severity; but, by his extremely contracted and feeble faculties, as the lowest in the scale of strictly rational and accountable creatures in the whole creation, he is infinitely incapable of any adequate conception of the greatness of the Being offended against. He is, then, according to the argument, obnoxious to a punishment not in any proportion to his own nature, but alone to that infinity of the supreme nature, which is to him infinitely unconceivable and unknown.

If an evil act of a human being may be of infinite demerit, why may not a good one be of infinite excellence or merit as having also a reference to the infinite Being? Is it not plain that every act of a finite nature must have, in all senses, the finite quality of that nature—cannot, therefore, be of infinite demerit?

Can we—I would say with reverence—can we realize it as possible that a lost soul, after countless millions of ages, and in prospect of an interminable succession of such enormous periods, can be made to have the conviction, absolute and perfect, that all this is a just, an equitable infliction, and from a Power as *good* as he is just, for a few short sinful years on earth—years and sins presumed to be retained most vividly in memory, and everlastingly growing clearer, vaster, and more terrible to retrospective view in their magnitude of infinite evil—every stupendous period of duration, by which they have actually been left at a distance, seeming to bring them, in contrariety to all laws of memory, nearer and ever nearer to view, by the continually aggravated experience of their consequences?

Yes, those twenty, forty, seventy years, growing up to infinity of horror in the review, in proportion to the distance which the condemned spirit recedes from them,—all eternity not sufficing to reveal fully what those years contained!—millions of ages for each single evil thought or word!

But it is usually alleged that there will be an endless *continuance* of sinning, with probably an endless aggravation, and *therefore* the punishment must be endless. Is not this like an admission of disproportion between the punishment and the *original cause* of its infliction? But suppose the case to be so—that is to say, that the punishment is not a retribution *simply* for the guilt of the momentary existence on earth, but a continued punishment of the continued, ever-aggravated guilt in the eternal state; the allegation is of no avail in vindication of the doctrine; because the first consignment to the dreadful state *necessitates a continuance of the criminality;* the doctrine teaching that it is of the essence, and is an awful aggravation, of the original consignment, that it dooms the condemned to maintain the criminal spirit unchanged forever. The doom to *sin* as well as to suffer, and according to the argument, to sin in order to suffer, is inflicted as the punishment of the sin committed in the mortal state. Virtually, therefore, the eternal punishment is the punishment of the sins of time.

Under the light (or the darkness) of this doctrine, how inconceivably mysterious and awful is the aspect of the whole economy of this human world! The immensely greater number of the race hitherto, through all ages and regions, passing a short life under no illuminating, transforming influence of their Creator; ninety-nine in a hundred of them perhaps having never even received any authenticated message from heaven, passing off the world in a state unfit for a spiritual, heavenly, and happy kingdom elsewhere; and all destined to everlasting misery. The thoughtful spirit has a question silently suggested to it of far more emphatic import than that of him who exclaimed, "Hast thou made all men *in vain?*"

Even the dispensation of redemption by the Mediator, the only light that shines through this dark economy, how profoundly mysterious in its slow progress, as yet, in its uncorrupted purity, and saving efficacy. What proportion of the earth's inhabitants are, at this hour, the subjects of its vital agency? It was not the divine volition that the success should be greater,—that a greater number should be saved by it,—or most certainly, most necessarily, the efficacy *would* have been greater. But in thus withholding from so large a proportion of mankind even the knowledge, and from so vast a majority in the nominally Christian nations the divine application, indispensable to the efficacy of the Christian dispensation, could it be that the divine purpose was to consign so many of his creatures, existing under such fearful circumstances, to the doom of eternal misery? Does the belief consist with any conception we can form of infinite goodness combined with infinite power?

But, after all this, we have to meet the grave question, *What say the Scriptures!* There is a force in their expressions at which we well may tremble. On *no* allowable interpretation do they signify less than a very protracted duration and formidable severity. But I hope it is not presumptuous to take advantage of the fact, that the terms everlasting, eternal, for ever, original or translated, are often employed in the Bible, as well as other writings, under great and various limitations of import; and are thus withdrawn from the predicament of *necessarily and absolutely* meaning a strictly endless duration. The limitation is often, indeed, plainly marked by the nature of the subject. In other instances the words are used with a figurative indefiniteness, which leaves the limitation to be made by some general rule of reason and proportion. They are designed to magnify, to aggravate, rather than to define. My resource in the present case, then, is simply this—that since the terms do not necessarily and absolutely signify an interminable duration,—and since there is in the present instance to be pleaded, for admitting a limited interpretation, a reason in the moral estimate of things, of stupendous, of infinite urgency, involving our conceptions overwhelmed in darkness and horror if it be rejected, I therefore conclude that a limited interpretation is authorized. Perhaps there is some pertinence in a suggestion which I recollect to have seen in some old and nearly unknown book in favor of universal restitution;—that the great difference of *degrees* of future punishment, so plainly stated in Scripture, affords an argument against its perpetuity; since, if the demerit be infinite, there can be no place for a scale of degrees, apportioning a minor infliction to some offenders;—every one should be punished up to the utmost that his nature can sustain; and the same reason of equity there may be for a limited measure, there may consistently be for a limited duration. The assignment of an unlimited duration would seem an abandonment of the *principle* of the discriminating rule observed in the adjustment of degrees.

If it be asked, *how could* the doctrine have been more plainly and positively asserted than it is in the Scripture language? In answer, I ask, how do *we* construct our words and sentences to express it in an absolute manner, so as to leave no *possibility* of understanding the language in a different, equivocal or

questionable sense? And may we not think that if so transcendently dreadful a doctrine had been meant to be stamped as in burning characters on our faith, there would have been such forms of proposition, of circumlocution if necessary, as would have rendered all doubt or question a mere palpable absurdity?

Some intelligent and devout inquirers, unable to admit the terrific doctrine, and yet pressed by the strength of the scripture *language*, have had recourse to a *literal* interpretation of the threatened destruction, the eternal death, as signifying *annihilation of existence, after* a more or less protracted penal infliction. Even this would be a prodigious relief: but it is an admission that the terms in question *do* mean something final, in an absolute sense. I have not directed much thought to this point; the grand object of interest being a negation of the perpetuity of misery. I have not been anxious for any satisfaction beyond *that;* though certainly one would wish to indulge the hope, founded on the divine attribute of infinite benevelence, that there will be a period somewhere in the endless futurity, when all God's sinning creatures will be restored by him to rectitude and happiness.

It often surprises me that the fearful doctrine sits, if I may so express it, so easy on the minds of the religious and benevolent believers of it. Surrounded immediately by the multitude of fellow-mortals, and looking abroad on the present, and back on the past state of the race, and regarding them, as to the immense majority, as subjects of so direful destination, how *can* they have any calm enjoyment of life, how can they be cordially cheerful, how can they escape the incessant haunting of dismal ideas, darkening the economy in which their lot is cast? I remember suggesting to one of them such an image as this:—suppose that so many of the great surrounding population as he could not, even in a judgment of charity, believe to be Christians, that is, to be in a safe state for hereafter,—suppose the case to be that he knew so many were all doomed to suffer, by penal infliction, a death by torture, in the most protracted agony, with what feelings would he look on the populous city, the swarming country, or even a crowded, mixed congregation? But what an infinitesimal trifle that would be in comparison with what he does believe in looking on these multitudes. How, then, can they bear the sight of the living world around them?

As to religious teachers, if the tremendous doctrine be true, surely it ought to be almost continually proclaimed as with the blast of a trumpet, inculcated and reiterated, with ardent passion, in every possible form of terrible illustration; no remission of the alarm to thoughtless spirits. What! believe them in such unconceivably dreadful peril, and not multiply and aggravate the terrors to frighten them out of their stupor; deploring still, that all the horrifying representations in the power of thought and language to make, are immeasurably below the real urgency of the subject; and almost wishing that some phenomenon of sight or sound might break in to make the impression that no words can make. If we saw a fellow-mortal stepping heedlessly or daringly on the utmost verge of some dreadful precipice or gulf, a humane spectator would raise and *continue* a shout, a scream, to prevent him. How, then, can it comport with the duty of preachers to satisfy themselves with brief, occasional references to this awful topic, when the most prolonged thundering alarm is but the note of an infant, a bird, or an insect, in proportion to the horrible urgency of the case?

There has been, in some quarters, what appears to me a miserably fallacious way of talking, which affects to dissuade from dwelling on such terrifying representations. They have said, These terrors tend only to harden the mind; approach the thoughtless beings rather, and almost exclusively, with the milder suasives, the gentle language of love. I cannot, of course, *mean* to say, that this also is not to be one of the expedients and of frequent application. But I do say, that to make this the main resource is not in consistency with the spirit of the bible, in which the larger proportion of what is said of sinners and addressed to them, *is plainly in a tone of menace* and alarm. Strange if it had been otherwise, when a righteous Governor was speaking to a depraved, rebellious race. Also it is matter of fact and experience, that it is very far oftener by impressions on fear that men are actually awakened to flee from the wrath to come. Let any one recall what he has known of such awakenings. Dr. Watts, all mild and amiable as he was, and delighted to dwell on the congenial topics, says deliberately, that of all the persons to whom his ministry had been efficacious, *only one* had received the first effectual impressions from the gentle and attractive aspects of religion; all the rest from the awful and alarming ones—the appeals to fear. And this is all but universally the manner of the divine process of conversion.

A number (not large, but of great piety and intelligence) of ministers within my acquaintance, several now dead, have been disbelievers of the doctrine in question; at the same time not feeling themselves imperatively called upon to make a public disavowal; content with employing in their ministrations strong general terms in denouncing the doom of the impenitent sinners. For one thing, a consideration of the unreasonable imputations and unmeasured suspicions apt to be cast on any publicly declared partial defection from rigid orthodoxy, has made them think they should better consult their usefulness by not giving a prominence to this dissentient point; while yet they make no concealment of it in private communications, and in answer to serious inquiries. When, besides, they have considered how strangely defective and feeble is the efficacy, to alarm and deter careless, irreligious minds, of the terrible doctrine itself notionally admitted by them, they have thought themselves the less required to propound one that so greatly qualifies the blackness of the prospect. They could not be unaware of the grievous truth of what is so strongly insisted on as an argument by the defenders of the tenet—that thoughtless and wicked men would be sure to seize on the mitigated doctrine to encourage themselves in their impenitence. But this is only the same perverse and fatal use that they may make of the doctrine of grace and mercy through Jesus Christ. If they *will* so abuse the truth we cannot help it. But methinks even this fact tells against the doctrine in question. If the very nature of man, as created, every individual, by the sovereign Power, be in such desperate disorder, that there is no possibility of conversion and salvation except in the instances where that Power interposes with a special and redeeming efficacy, how can we conceive that the main proportion of the race thus morally impotent (that is, really and absolutely impotent) will be eternally punished for the inevitable result of this moral impotence? But this I have said before.

With all good wishes for the success of your studies and ministrations,

I am, dear sir, yours truly.

## ELDER JOHN TATE'S DEFENCE.

[Continued from page 164.]

Before I refer to the Scriptures to ascertain what they teach respecting the dead, I wish to say that I think they distinctly affirm the consciousness of some in the intermediate state. I say of some, not all. It seems to me that some highly favored sons of heaven have been embodied in celestial structures, and by means of that embodiment they live in a state of consciousness. But this is an exception to the general rule. The great majority of the dead are in my judgment without thought and consciousness. I know of no passage in the Bible which explicitly states or fairly implies the consciousness of *all* the dead. I am not disposed on this or any other point to draw a sweeping universal conclusion from particular premises. As I view the subject I can see a delightful harmony in the revelations of God respecting the separate state. But the two doctrines, that ALL the dead are conscious, and that NONE of the dead are conscious, appears to me equally to mistake the meaning of some portions of the Bible. The advocates of both these doctrines find it difficult to make the scriptures support their favorite notions. While I admit that some of the departed are conscious, I maintain that others are *not*. This last is the part which I have to prove. Ps. 6: 5, "For in death there is no remembrance of thee; in *sheol* who shall give thee thanks?" Sheol is defined by Gesenius as follows—"*Orcus, the under world*, a vast subterranean place, full of thick darkness, in which are congregated the shades of the dead." Gesenius does not refer it at all to the grave. He limits the word entirely to the receptacle of departed shades. Now according to the Psalmist, there is in sheol no ascriptions of praise and thanksgiving to God. It is a world of thick darkness and of silence, where no light is seen, no sound heard. But how different the representations of our modern theology. We sing,

> "And let this feeble body fail,
> And let it faint or die;
> My soul shall quit this mournful vale,
> And soar to worlds on high:
> Shall join the disembodied saints,
> And find its long sought rest;
> That only bliss for which it pants,
> In the Redeemer's breast."

The poetry is beautiful I allow; but the sentiment does not harmonize with the language of David, 'For in death there is no remembrance of thee; in *sheol* who shall give thee thanks?' Job, in the depth of his affliction, in the bitterness of his soul, desired to die and be hidden in sheol. His description of sheol is as follows, 10: 21, 22, "Before I go whence I shall not return, even to the land of darkness and the shadow of death, a land of darkness, as darkness itself; and of the shadow of death, without any order, and where the light is as darkness." Dr. Clarke on this passage says: "What do we know of the state of separate spirits? What do we know of the spiritual world? How do souls exist separate from their respective bodies? Of what are they capable, and what is their employment? Who can answer these questions? Perhaps nothing can be said much better of the state, than is here said, *a land of obscurity like darkness.*"

Again he says on the same passage and in reference to the same place and state of darkness, "It is the state of the dead. The place of separate spirits. It is out of time, out of probation, beyond change or mutability. It is on the confines of eternity."

These statements are explicit. Dr. Clarke, you see, was as really a heretic in relation to the state of departed spirits as I am; if tested by your opinions. Nor is this the only instance in which his heretical ideas are developed, as I shall soon show.

But to return to Job. Such was his wretched condition, that he desired to die and enter into sheol. 14: 12–15. Here we see that Job wished to depart from life and find a resting place in the dark deeps of sheol. He expected that for a time the wrath of God would rest upon a guilty world, during which period no special favor would be shown to the righteous dead. But he indulged a good hope and confidence of a final deliverance from the land of forgetfulness. He prayed that at the end of the indignation, God would remember him. He inquired, "If a man die shall he live again?" And firmly believing that he would be at last quickened into life, he looks forward with pleasure to the period of his resuscitation, "All the days of my appointed time will I wait till my change come. Thou shalt call and I will answer thee; thou wilt have a desire to the work of thy hands." God will call his soul from sheol, and his body from the grave, and then for himself in his own flesh he shall see his Redeemer. Such were the views of Job respecting the state of the dead, and hence his only hope of future conscious existence was by a resurrection from the dead. I will next refer to the testimony of Solomon, Eccl. 9: 4–6.

It is very common for writers and preachers against Universalism to say to the advocates of that system, "Supposing there be a state of future retribution, how could that fact be more explicitly and appropriately asserted than in the language of the Bible?" And so I might say in reference to the state of the dead—if the dead are unconscious, how could that fact be more positively and appropriately affirmed than in the language of Solomon! There is a contrast in the text, and the common theory makes it a contrast between an immortal soul in this life and a dead body in the grave. According to this interpretation, it is the dead body that does not know anything—a wonderful discovery, truly. But whoever carefully reads the passage will see that the contrast is between men in life and men in death; between men in a state of knowledge, and men in a state of total ignorance; between men in a state of enjoyment, and men incapable of enjoyment. Hewlett says, in reference to the passage, "It is the remark of one who knew not of immortality." I would say, it is the remark of one who knew nothing of the natural immortality of the soul, and its consciousness in the intermediate state. This is positively asserted in the text, "The dead know not anything; * * * their love and their hatred and their envy are perished;" and in the 10th verse he repeats the same sentiment, "For there is no work, nor device, *nor knowledge*, nor wisdom, in sheol, whither thou goest." Sheol, you will bear in mind, is the place of disembodied souls---"the under world where are congregated the shades of the dead." Among these departed shades, Solomon says, there is no love, nor hatred, nor envy; no work nor device; no knowledge nor wisdom. And where all these are wanting, it must be evident there can be no intellectual activity.

And do not you, brethren, sometimes affirm the same doctrine in your devotions? Often do you sing---

> "The living know that they must die,
> But all the dead forgotten lie;
> Their memory and their sense are gone,
> Alike unknowing and unknown."

Such language must refer to something which had been the subject of sensation, memory and intelligence. But these are attributes of the mind. Of the mind you affirm, after it has gone away into sheol, that it is "alike unknowing and nnknown."

Again, I have heard thousands of Methodists and others sing as follows:

"And am I born to die,
To lay this body down?
And must my trembling spirit fly
Into a world unknown?
A land of deepest shade,
Unpierced by human thought;
The dreary regions of the dead,
Where all things are forgot."

Will you tell me these last lines refer to the grave? What, then, I ask, is there of unfathomable mystery about a hole dug in the earth, two feet wide, six feet long, and six feet deep? Is such a cavity as that "unpierced by human thought?" And then again are all things forgotten in the grave? If so, what is it that forgets? Is it the body or the soul? If it is the body, then the body remembered prior to its interment, and if you say it is the soul that forgets, then plainly you bury body and soul in the grave. *No. No.* The grave is not meant. The land of deepest shade, unpierced by human thought, &c., &c., can be none other than sheol, the under world where are congregated the shades of the dead. And of that mysterious state and place of existence, Mr. Wesley said, and Methodists have sung—

"The dreary regions of the dead,
Where ALL things are FORGOT."

Hezekiah's views of the state of the dead were in perfect unison with those of Job and David and Solomon. He was one of the most pious and intelligent kings that ever reigned over Judah. (See 2 Kings 18: 1--6.) When recovered from a serious sickness, he recorded the divine goodness manifested in his deliverance. Said he, Is. 38: 17--19, "Behold for peace I had great bitterness; but thou hast in love to my soul delivered it from the pit of corruption; for thou hast cast all my sins behind thy back. For the grave cannot praise thee, (Heb. *sheol* cannot praise thee;) death cannot celebrate thee; they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth. The living, the living, he shall praise thee, as I do this day; the father to the children shall make known thy truth."

It is impossible to suppose that the theology of Hezekiah would differ essentially from that of David and Solomon and Isaiah. He was a devout student, and was well instructed in the things of God. Now, if he believed in the consciousness and happiness of departed saints, why this dark picture of the state of the dead? The pious now, in view of death, sing—

"Fill'd with delight, my raptur'd soul
Would here no longer stay:
Though Jordan's waves around me roll,
Fearless I'd launch away."

And after the man is dead, you go and commit his body the grave. You gaze for the last time on the inanimate dust and you sing,

"With solemn delight I survey,
The corpse when the spirit is fled:
In love with the beautiful clay.
And longing to lie in its stead."

If Hezekiah believed as you do, why this almost infinite difference of anticipation and expression? "That *only* bliss for which you pant" you expect to receive as soon as you are dead. Hence it is you pray—

"Come, Lord of Hosts, the waves divide,
And land us all in Heaven."

But the Jewish King could see no such glory in the immediate future. *He* saw before him a pit of corruption—a dark and dreary sheol, where no hope was indulged, no song of praise ascended up to God. On the contrary, *He* said, "The living, the living, he shall praise thee as I do this day; the father to the children shall make known thy truth."

These testimonies are sufficient for my present purpose. I shall endeavor to show hereafter that on this point the New Testament is in harmony with the old. I now return to the objection, i. e., That so far as God literally threatened Adam with the termination of life, he meant natural life, not the immortal life of the soul. The notion that the soul is naturally immortal finds no countenance in the testimonies which I have quoted; on the contrary that notion and these testimonies cannot stand together. And I think I have shown that I am supported in my interpretation by the statements of Dr. Clarke—the premises laid down by Mr. Wesley, and Mr. Isaac Taylor, and by your sacred songs. I am compelled to believe that immortality is a *privilege* as Mr. Watson represents it. When, therefore, God announced the penalty, "Dying thou shalt die," it affected Adam in his entire being. Had it not been for the scheme of redemption, Adam would have utterly perished in body and soul; he would have become a thing of naught, and had no more place as an intelligent being in the universe of God.

I will now pass on to another consideration, though it is intimately connected with the argument just advanced. If the soul be immortal in its own nature—if it experience inconceivable joy or exquisite agony in the separate state, *how* is it these facts are not distinctly affirmed in the Old Testament? Our Discipline says, "The Old Testament is not contrary to the New, for both in the Old and New Testaments everlasting life is offered to mankind through Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and Man. "Wherefore they are not to be heard who feign that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises." Now I ask, where do you find the promises made to the old fathers of consciousness and happiness in the separate state? Are there any such promises in the Pentateuch, in Joshua, in Judges, the two Books of Samuel, in Esther or Ruth? I have not been able to find them; if there, they are wrapt up within the folds of dim obscurity. But the holy light of heaven's truth shone brighter and more beautiful as the ages passed away. Go, then, to David, and ask the ground of his hope and rejoicing. Was it that he would soon die and go away into sheol? *No.* He did not rejoice as you do because he was going into it, but that he would be finally taken out of it. Speaking of the wicked and then of himself, he says, Ps. 49: 14–15. "Like sheep they are laid in the grave; death shall feed on them, and the upright shall have dominion over them in the morning, and their beauty shall consume in the grave from their dwelling. But God shall redeem my soul from the power of the grave, for he shall receive me." Here David looks for his joy and victory, not in the intermediate state, but in the resurrection. So he does in the 17th Ps. "As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness, I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness."

Solomon in Ecclesiastes gives no intimation of the natural immortality of the soul, nor did he teach, as

some have believed, the eternal sleep of Man. He traces the living man into the darkness and silence of sheol, but does not leave him there forever. He declares that "God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil." Now, the two great events of a resurrection and judgment, are almost uniformly in scripture placed in close proximity to each other. Solomon then teaches the revival of the consciousness and intelligence of man by a resurrection from the dead. Eccl. 12: 7, "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." These words were urged against me. I remark—

1. It would be difficult to prove that the spirit alluded to means the rational soul.

2. Admitting that the rational soul is intended, its consciousness in the separate state is neither affirmed nor *implied*. God is in sheol, and to go to God in the sense of the passage, is nothing more than to go into sheol, where the dead cannot give thanks to God, but where all things are forgotten. Thus David says, Ps. 139: 8, "If I ascend up into heaven thou art there; if I make my bed in sheol, behold thou art there." Whenever, then, a human soul goes to the under world, it goes to God, for God is there. And that world is

> "A land of deepest shade,
> Unpierced by human thought,
> The dreary regions of the dead,
> *Where all things are forgot.*"

Such are the general representations of the Old Testament respecting the state of the dead and their future resuscitation. But if these ancient saints believed as you do about an immortal soul, why did they not talk about an immortal soul? If they believed that "death was the gate to endless joy," why did they speak of it as the gate to silence, darkness and unconsciousness? If they believed in the natural immortality of the soul, and in bliss or pain surpassing thought immediately after death, why did they not urge these notions just as you do to deter from sin and stimulate to righteousness? They urged no such inducements. They never speak of an immortal soul. They refer us to the time when the dead should be raised as the time of their reward and glory. *Then* not before did the Hebrew Prophets expect to be quickened into a conscious existence, which should go on increasing in light and power and beauty to all eternity.

So far, then, as the old revelation extends, I claim to be orthodox, and therefore not deserving excommunication at your hands.

## THE NATURE OF MAN'S SPIRIT.

BY THOMAS READ, NEW YORK.

[Continued from p. 165.]

A few texts will require a more particular exposition. Eccl. 3: 18, "I said in my heart concerning the estate of the sons of men that God might manifest them, and that they may see that they themselves are like the beasts. For that which befalleth the sons of men, befalleth beasts; even *one thing befalleth them:* as the *one dieth, so dieth the other;* yea, they have *all* ONE [*ruach, spirit, or*] *breath;* so that a man hath NO *pre-eminence above a beast;* for all is vanity. (All are subject to decay.) *All go to one place*, all are of the dust, and *all* turn to dust again."

We paraphrase the remainder: "Who knoweth any difference between the ruach, spirit or breath, of the sons of Adam, that in consequence of his erect position, ascendeth upwards, or the ruach, spirit or breath, of the beasts that in consequence of the downward position of his head, descends the earth?"

Here it is emphatically asserted that the kind of life is precisely the same in man and beast, that the kind of ruach, spirit or breath, is the same in both.

In the manner of their death they are precisely alike; and that they, the whole of them, alike return to the earth. At the same time, there is a vast difference between the aspiring nature af the one, owing to his superior organization, and his more exalted faculties, and the grovelling nature of the other. This language is so explicit, and so utterly irreconcilable with the notion of any separate intelligence that continues to live, while the man himself is dead, and is all consigned to the earth but his breath, that we might almost suppose that it was recorded purposely to refute, and for ever confound, any that should suppose that the essential man lived, while his body was entirely decomposed.

The Vulgate reads a little stronger. "I said in my heart concerning the sons of men, that God would prove them, and show *them* to be *like beasts*. Therefore, the *death of man and of beasts is one;* and the *condition of them both is equal; as man dieth, so they also die; all* things *breathe alike;* and *man hath* NOTHING MORE *than beast; all* things are subject to vanity, and *all* things go to *one place;* of earth *they* were made, and into earth *they return* TOGETHER. Who knoweth *if* the spirit of the children of Adam ascend upward, and *if* the spirit of the beast descend downward? In Eccl. 12: 5–7, it is said, "Because man goeth to his long home, and the mourners go about the streets * * then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the (ruach) spirit shall return unto God who gave it. Vanity of vanities; all is vanity." Rom. 8: 20, "Man was made subject to vanity;" that is, to decay, to death and destruction. The words of Solomon can mean no more than that God gathers to himself the spirit of man which is the source of active life; or, resumes again "the spirit of the breath of lives," and then necessarily *man*, the whole man, returns to his elementary dust. If the death of man exalted him immediately to a higher state of life, how could the Preacher pronounce the death of man vanity? The same meaning is expressed in other words in Ps. 104: 25, "Thou takest away their breath, they die, and return to their dust." And again, Job 34: 14, "If [God] set his heart upon man, if he gather unto himself his spirit and his breath, (that is, God's spirit or God's breath,) all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust." And yet again in Ps. 146: 4, "His breath goeth forth, HE returneth to his earth; *in that very day his thoughts perish.*"

How weak must be that cause, and how reckless that person, that shall persist in their attempts to make Solomon in the 12th chapter, contradict Solomon in the 3d and 9th chapter. Does Eccl. 12: 7, sustain the monstrous proposition, that the spirit is an independent living entity, immortal in its own nature, existing without any organization, and that it has more knowledge, when separated from the man, than the compound man himself? Especially when the same writer expressly declares "that the dead know not anything," and in the immediate connection declares man to be vanity? When the spirit is separated from the man, it forms no part of the man, nor does it belong to him in any sense whatever. It is the breath of the Almighty which gave him life for a time, but which God has gathered again into the common stock of all living creatures. If God were

to put his spirit or breath into him again, it would not be the same identical spirit or breath; but spirit of the same kind, from the general stock. For proof refer to Ezek. 37: 5, 6, 9, 14; for God would put his spirit, brought from the four winds, into *him*, and he would live. In Rev. 11: 11, after the two witnesses had finished their testimony, and were slain, and remained unburied three days and a half, the *spirit of life* from God entered into them again, and they lived. This figurative relation is, of course, founded upon the literal. But again, as the word *ruach* occurs in the original Hebrew in almost every place where the word breath is found; it should have been uniformly translated when indicating the spirit of life. We might consistently translate Eccl. 12: 7, "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the (ruach) breath shall return to God who gave it." Still again, as Solomon declares that men and beasts have all the same (ruach) spirit, and that they all go to the same place, according to the argument of our opponents, the spirits of beasts, and the spirits of *all* men, *bad* as well as good, go to God; and that the spirits of the beasts, as well as the spirits of the wicked, are alive, while they are dead, and happy and rejoicing with the righteous in the presence of God! And this, notwithstanding Solomon himself declares that they were all made of dust, and that they all returned to dust together, that there was no difference in death between the man and the beast. And again, "For the living know that they must die; (they were wiser in Solomon's days than now, for now they say the spirit lives forever;) but the dead know not anything," (and not more than they knew while living. There love, envy and hatred are now perished. And again, "There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither THOU goest." Eccl. 9: 5, 10. Where the *man himself is, there* is no knowledge, and *he* goes to the *grave*, and not to heaven till he rises from the grave.

If the expression should appear in this work that the "spirit dies," we mean merely to oppose the idea, when the man dies, that *any part of him* survives. When the spirit is "yielded up," "breathed out," or "expired," without being inspired, the man himself is necessarily dead.

In Acts 7: 59, Stephen said, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." It is thought by some, that this language favors the idea that the spirit is a separate conscious intelligence. We regard this language as implying nothing more than that he commended himself, or his life, to God; for after this, it is said of him, that he fell asleep. As the word rendered *receive*, also means accept, we may understand it as equivalent to the expression, "Lord Jesus, accept me." The words of our Saviour admit of a similar explanation: "Into thy hands I commend my spirit." Zech. 12: 1, has been quoted to sustain the popular view: "The Lord, which stretcheth forth the heavens, and layeth the foundation of the earth, and formeth the spirit of man within him, will make Jerusalem a cup of trembling." But it asserts most clearly that the spirit of man was not *him*, or the man, being within him. We consider that the first three clauses are highly figurative representations, that God created all things, and especially the living man, and man cannot evade his judgment. That God created the heavens, the earth, and man, or the life of man that is within him.

When the disciples saw Jesus walking on the sea, they were troubled, saying, "It is a spirit." The Apostles were also terrified at the sudden appearance of Jesus after his resurrection, and supposed that they had seen a spirit. These places have been quoted as warranting the idea that the spirit is a separate entity from the man, and has been seen in a disengaged form. But in both places the Greek word is phantasma, and should have been translated a phantom, or a delusive appearance, an apparition. Some suppose that the idea, that the spirit is a separate intelligence, may be gathered from Rom. 8: 16. Volumes have been written on the "The Witness of the Spirit," based upon a misunderstanding of this passage. God communicates with his creatures in a rational manner, and always in accordance with the laws of their physical organization. The *testimony* of the Spirit is always in words. "Thou didst testify against them by thy spirit, by the hands of thy prophets." Neh. 9: 30. The figure in Rom. is the taking of a slave and making him a son. We will venture a paraphrase: Ye have not received of God the spirit or disposition of a slave, who, under the bondage of fear, cries, Master, Master, how shall we act to avoid thy chastisement? But ye have received the *spirit of adoption*, the spirit, or disposition of a child, and now with filial confidence and affection, ye cry, Abba, Father, thou hast graciously adopted us into thy family, and made us thy heirs, and joint heirs with Jesus Christ, thy Son, who has now become our elder Brother; we therefore now gratefully inquire how we may best manifest our loving obedience to thee: and *this identical or self-same spirit of adoption*, or filial disposition, this confidence in thy fatherly care over us, which has so completely dissipated all fears for the future; *this* spirit witnesseth with our spirits or understandings that we are truly the children of God.

The scriptures distinguish between the spirit of man proper, which we have found to be his breath, or principle of active life, and the mind or disposition, which is sometimes called the spirit. The mind is declared to be carnal. Rom. 8: 7, "The carnal mind is enmity against God." 6th v. "The thinking (phroneema) of the flesh is death; but the thinking of the spirit is life and peace. Because the thinking of the flesh is enmity against God." Gal. 5: 19, "The works of the flesh are * * * idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like. All these are the works of the mind or spirit; and all such are declared to be carnal, and therefore the offspring of the faculties that inhere in the flesh. The rational and christian use of the same faculties are declared to be the works of the spirit, aad these too belong to the same mind. The organs of sight and hearing are organs by which the mind perceives, and are therefore organs of the mind; the organs of thought, affections and reason are equally organs of the mind. At death, all these organs are destroyed, and therefore the bible and reason declare, that man's love, hatred, envy, memory, ah! and his very thoughts, are then perished. Eccl: 9: 5, "So then, the spirit, or mind, is a part of our *animal nature*, and when uninfluenced by a spirit EXTRINSIC and divine, is altogether FLESHLY, CORRUPT, and material; and consequently *cannot be immorta!*."

[To be continued.]

———o———

TO OUR "OFFER" of the Examiner for '50, '51 and '52, for $2, we will now add, if any choose '49 instead of '51, they may have it. Some have '51 already; they may have '49, '50 and 52 for the $2 so long as we have any of '49 in sheets.

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, DECEMBER, 1851.


BIBLE EXAMINER.—The present number completes the sixth volume of the Examiner; and we desire to acknowledge the mercy of God and his good hand that has upheld us. That we have given satisfaction to all we do not suppose. We have endeavored to follow what seemed to us to be the path of duty. We have kept constantly in mind our avowed object in publishing the Examiner, viz: mainly to discuss the subject of *Immortality through Christ alone*, and spread abroad information on that subject. To some it has, doubtless, seemed too exclusively occupied with that topic. Others may have felt dissatisfaction when we have on any occasion departed from that one point. We are always sorry to grieve any, but cannot depart from our conviction of duty to please them. The paper will still be devoted to the object for which it was started, and we shall be glad of the co-operation and aid of all such as are disposed to help us in our course. We shall be sorry to take leave of any of our readers; those, however, who choose to withdraw the sustaining hand, we hope may be better fed and nourished from some other source. If we have wronged any of them, we have not intended it, and hope they will forgive us. We bid them an affectionate *farewell.*

As to the pecuniary affairs of the Examiner, we have been somewhat unfortunate this year, so that we have not realized a dollar for all our *personal* labor and toil in publishing it; still, we are not disheartened. Though our terms are payment in advance, in all cases, we have never refused to send the paper when the subscriber has intimated that he wanted credit for a short time. In most cases of this character, however, we have not been paid to this hour; and about *one-ninth* part of those to whom we send the Examiner have paid us *nothing* this year. In addition to this number, one in twenty-five receive the paper *gratis.* Some who promised to pay us this year made the same promise last, and have now received the paper two years without paying anything, or making even an apology for not doing it. If they *desire* us to *forgive* them the *debt*, we shall do so cheerfully, much as we need the money to sustain ourself and family. We do not preach for a *salary*, and have not asked those among whom we have labored for the last ten years, to do anything for us; and those to whom we have ministered in this city will bear us witness that we have never asked them for a cent, nor said to them, *You do not help enough*; yet the amount received the year past, from this source, has been less than $200. This statement is not made by way of complaint. "The poor ye have always with you," said the Saviour; and "to the poor the gospel is preached."

We have said thus much simply to induce our friends abroad, and in this city, not only to continue *their* subscription to the Examiner, but to make an immediate effort to increase the number of paying subscribers. We shall adhere to our terms of payment in advance, *in all cases*, except where we send *gratis;* which cannot be to many, unless our paying list is much increased. None need have any apprehensions that the Examiner will not be published through 1852; if life and health are preserved, and the *Lord will*, it will not be discontinued, even if we have to work nights to earn money to pay the printer.

*Shall we have an immediate response?*

—o—

"THE OFFER" to send the Examiner for the years '50, '51, and '52, for $2, cannot apply to persons out of the United States, unless they *add* the amount we are compelled to *pre-pay* for *postage.*

—o—

ANOTHER OFFER.—Any person sending us $10 by January, shall have *fifteen* copies of the Examiner for 1852, if sent to *one address.* This offer will not apply after January, nor to any out of the United States, unless the postage is added.

—o—

"THE SPIRIT WORLD" DISAPPEARED.—We used to see it pretty regularly; but of late it has entirely disappeared. What has become of it? Can our old friend Sunderland tell us? Now, do let us look into it occasionally, even if we do comment a little; we do so only in love. We have continued to send the Examiner directed to the Spirit World, and hope it arrives safe. What say friend Sunderland, does it find an open door, or is there a *shut-door*? We pause and listen! Shall we hear a *rap?*

—o—

## THE GOSPEL HOPE.

A SERMON. BY THE EDITOR.

*Preached in Philadelphia, Sunday, Nov. 9th,* 1851.

TEXT.—"Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and reverence."—1 PETER III 15.

The exercise of *hope* is common to man. It is well understood to be made up of *desire* and *expectation.* Neither of these *alone* constitute hope. The first without the last would be *despair;* and the last without the first would be *aversion.* The two must be combined to form hope. The principle is well defined in the minds of men in relation to the ordinary affairs of life; and the man who should tell us he hoped to possess ten thousand dollars on the morrow, we would conclude had not only a desire for that sum, but a *reason* for his expectation; and if he had none, or no good reason for it, we should not hesitate to say he is a fanatic or a fool. Why should we expect less in matters of religion? Men say they hope to be

saved, they hope to go to heaven when they die, &c.; that is, they *desire* and *expect* to go to heaven when they die.

Now, we ask such, *a reason* of the hope that is in them? A good reason must be based first, on *a promise* of God. If there is no promise of such a remove at death, then the expectation of it is without foundation, and the exercise of mind is *presumption*, and not the gospel hope. The promise of such a remove at death must not be a matter of mere *inference* or *conjecture;* it must have a "*Thus saith the Lord.*" God does not leave his creatures to mere conjecture, or the traditions of men, in matters which relate to blessings he designs for them; he gives the most plain and positive assurances or promises. Thus the Apostle speaks, Heb. 6: 17, "Wherein God, willing more abundantly to show unto the *heirs of promise* the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath: that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon *the hope* set before us."

Here we see, for the existence and stability of hope, God does not leave us without a certain and definite promise. Hence if we have a hope of entering heaven *at death*, we shall be able to fix on a clear promise of God to that effect; else we have no well-grounded expectation of such an event, and our hope is *baseless*. Where is such a promise? With *meekness* produce it, and let us have the *reason* of such a hope. We do not ask you for the *traditions* of men on the subject, but for a Bible promise. Will you give it? You are bound by the gospel to do it, if you can. Can you produce such a promise? If so, where is it? We wait for an answer. But, alas, we wait in vain! No such promise is found in the Bible. The notion stands in the wisdom and traditions of men, not in the truth and power of God. If we are correct, then the hope of going to heaven *at death* is not a "good hope;" there is no gospel *reason* for it: it is a *fancy*—yea, it is *presumption*.

The gospel hope, then, is quite another matter from the hope of a large part of the professedly Christian church. The gospel hope is that of *Eternal Life* THROUGH *and* BY *a Resurrection from the dead*, and not of an entrance into heaven when we die. For this hope we have clear promises in the Bible.

*What are the promises?* We will give you a few examples. Luke 14: 15. The Saviour had commanded concerning feasts not to call the rich, &c., lest a recompense be made thee; but call the poor, &c., and "thou shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee; for thou shalt be recompensed [when you die? No, but] AT the RESURRECTION of the just." Here is a clear promise of the *time* when the reward of well doing is to be bestowed; and it is as wide of the common notion as the resurrection day differs from the day of death. That we do not mistake in this matter, we turn to John 6th. In this chapter, four times our Lord states the time *when*, and the means *by which*, his followers are to receive their reward; and we ask, if it looks like a promise of going to heaven *at death?* See verses 39, 40, 44, and 54. "This is the Father's *will*, which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should LOSE *nothing*, but should RAISE IT UP *at the last day.*" Here is no intimation of going to heaven at death; but there is a clear intimation that without a resurrection from the dead, Christ's follower would be *lost.* Yet, as it is the Father's *will* that they shall not be lost, he has given to his Son power and authority to raise them from the dead at a stated point of time, viz: "*at the last day.*" In the next verse he is still more definite as to what he raises them up for. "This is the *will* of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have EVERLASTING LIFE: and I will raise *him* up at the last day." Does Jesus say, I will *re unite* his soul and body again in the last day? No. "I will raise *him* up." What does *him* signify? Is it *his body? Him* is, *that man*; not that man's *body* merely. He is raised up, and is at the last day, and for the purpose of giving *him* that which the Father hath *willed*, viz: Everlasting Life.

That our Lord's followers thus understood the matter is evident in the discourse of Martha with him, John 11th: "Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died," said Martha, verse 21. "Jesus said unto her, [thy brother has *gone to heaven?* No, but] thy brother shall *rise again.*" "Martha said unto him, I *know* that he shall rise again in the resurrection AT THE LAST DAY." Such was her faith, and such her *hope;* and such is *the hope* of the gospel. Remember, Jesus had declared "Lazarus *is dead.*" But he does not flatter with a fallacious hope that he had gone to heaven, but he does comfort with the true hope—The Resurrection.

Another case in point is the question of Peter, Matt. 19: 27, "Peter said unto him, Behold, we have forsaken all, and followed thee; *what* shall we have therefore?" Here is a plain question about the reward to be *hoped* for. Does our Lord say, Ye shall go to heaven when ye die? No such thing. How unlike the theology of this age is his answer. Mark it well. "Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me, *in the regeneration* WHEN THE SON OF MAN SHALL SIT IN THE THRONE OF HIS GLORY, *ye also* shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." From Matt. 25: 31, we learn *when* Christ will sit in the throne of his glory. "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, THEN shall he sit upon the throne of his glory." It is not till his *return* from heaven; his promise to Peter and the other Apostles was not of heaven in an intermediate period, but looked down to the time of his return *from* heaven.

This point is clear; but we shall have occasion to insist upon it more fully as we proceed.

We have glanced at some of the promises, and see that none of them look like an assurance of a reward prior to the resurrection. We will now examine the *type* and see if that is not as clearly against the idea of any man entering into heaven till Christ returns. To understand this part of the subject the type and antitype are to be taken in connection. We shall hence notice the law of the holy of holies, and the high priest's entrance therein, with Paul's remarks on the subject in Hebrews.

In Leviticus 16th we have the law referred to, which relates to the offering of the high priest, first for himself and then for the people. In the holy of holies was the mercy seat and the *Shekinal glory*, or symbol of the presence of God. It was there the blood of the slain victim was to be carried by the high priest and sprinkled upon the mercy-seat and before the mercy-seat, to make an atonement. Now mark verse 17, "There shall be *no man* in the tabernacle of the congregation when he [the high priest] goeth in to make an atonement in the holy place, UNTIL HE COME OUT," &c. So sacredly was the holy of holies guarded by the law that even the two hundred and fifty Levites, connected with Korah, claiming that "all the congregation were *holy*," when they approached the door of the tabernacle, to intrude into the holy place, there came out a fire from the Lord and consumed them: see Numbers 16th. The people of Israel generally were prohibited, on pain of death, coming nigh the tabernacle: see Numbers 18: 22. But the main point to which we call attention is the fact, no man was permitted to enter the holy of holies while the high priest was therein, nor *until he came out.* Now if we find this is truly a type, we may learn that it is no small sin to attempt to enter heaven before Christ the High Priest comes out. We now turn to Heb. 8: 1, "We have a high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; a minister of the sanctuary—*agion*—holy—and of the *true* tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man. For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer. For if he were on earth he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law: who serve unto the *example and shadow* of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle: for See, saith he, "that thou make all things according to the PATTERN showed thee in the mount."

Here we learn the fact that the Mosaic tabernacle was but the rype of the true; and we may also learn that the Aaronic high priesthood was a type of that of Jesus; for, saith Paul, ch. 9: 11–12, "Christ being come a high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle not made with hands; that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by *his own blood* he entered in ONCE into the HOLY PLACE, having obtained eternal redemption." He adds, verses 23, 24, after having spoken of the Aaronic offerings, "It was therefore necessary that the *patterns* of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the *figures of the true;* but INTO HEAVEN ITSELF, *now to appear in the presence of God for us.*"

Thus have we a clear statement of facts, and find the antitype of the entrance of the Aaronic high priest into the holy of holies. Christ has entered the *true* holy of holies, even heaven itself; and no man is to be permitted to enter there till he comes out: *the attempt of itself is sin;* though it may be it has been the sin of ignorance; of that God only is judge. We fear it is the result, in many, of *wilful* ignorance. Christ has gone into the holy of holies; are we to seek to enter there? If we do, it is at our peril. What shall we do? Do as did the people of Israel when their high priest was in the holy place. They waited without, watching and praying till he *came out.* Thus Paul, in closing Heb. 9th, says:—"Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many—and unto them that *look* for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation."

This is a clear reference to the work of the high priest under the law. With the blood of the offering for sin he went into the holy place, and sprinkled it upon and before the mercy-seat, while the people prayed, confessed their sins, and waited, looking for the high priest to come out. So Christ has gone into the true holy place, even heaven itself, and there appears in the presence of God with his own blood; and to those who acknowledge him as their high priest, confess their sins, watch and pray, and *look* for him to come out, he will appear in due time, *from* heaven, for their salvation.

How blasphemous and presumptuous to attempt to enter the holy place, *heaven*, while our High Priest is there. May Christian men be made aware of such presumption, and cease to talk and act in such an unscriptural manner. They may flatter themselves that it is very innocent to teach and talk about going to heaven at death; yet we venture the affirmation, that it is not only sinful to do so, but tends to subvert the gospel hope, by substituting another and entirely different hope; and hence is "another gospel" than that which Christ and his Apostles preached. This we are aware is a heavy charge; yet we believe we have fully sustained it, but shall now proceed to confirm and strengthen it.

Let us look at Paul's language relating to the gospel hope. Acts 23: 6, "Of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question." Then surely

he preached the resurrection of the dead as the gospel hope; unless he was called in question for something he did not preach. But let us see, Acts 26: 6–8, he says, "Now I stand and am judged for *the hope* OF THE PROMISE made of God unto our Fathers: unto which our twelve tribes, instantly serving, day and night, hope to come. For which *hope's sake*, King Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews. Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should *raise the dead?*" Here again is seen the burden and hope of Apostolic preaching. It is a future life, by a resurrection from the dead. He adds, verses 22 and 23, "Having obtained help of God, I continue unto this day *witnessing* to both small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come: that Christ should suffer, and that he should be *the first* that should RISE FROM THE DEAD," &c. Not only is it the Apostolic burden and hope, the resurrection, but he affirms the same things were the theme of the Prophets and Moses: *the hope is one.* Not an intimation thus far of the notion of entering the holy of holies—heaven—at death, or at all: it is the hope of the resurrection. He has shown us *that* was "the hope of Israel," as well as the hope of the gospel; and chap. 28: 20, in his bondage at Rome, he saith, "For the hope of Israel I am bound with this chain."

But we will now see whether Paul does not with equal clearness state the hope of the gospel in his Epistles. 1 Corth. 15: 12–19, "Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? But if there is no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen * * * then is your faith vain * * * then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are *perished*," i. e., they are lost out of being—there is *no hope* for them; for, "If in this life only we have *hope* in Christ, we are of all men most miserable." That the Apostle has reference to the hope of a future life by a resurrection is clear from what he saith at verse 32, "If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, [exposing my life] what advantageth it me IF THE DEAD RISE NOT?" Plainly affirming he had no hope of going to heaven at death, and that he had acted a foolish part in hazarding his life at Ephesus, if there is no resurrection. Such a course would be folly indeed; rather "Let us eat and drink," if there is no resurrection, "for to-morrow we die," and there is no hope beyond that. Such is the Apostle's conclusion if there is to be no resurrection of the dead. But this reasoning is both absurd and false, if he could or would go to heaven at death.

But again, Paul saith, Rom. 8: 23, after speaking of the groaning creation, "And not only it, but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting [to go to heaven at death? No, but] for the adoption, to wit, THE REDEMPTION OF OUR BODY:" not its dissolution by death. He adds, "For we are saved by *hope;* but hope that is seen is not hope: for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for? But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it." And what does the Apostle affirm he and the Christians of his time were *"waiting for?"* Answer, "The redemption of our body," that is, for the coming of Christ *from* heaven and *the resurrection.* This will be clearly seen by comparing what he saith here with Phil. 3: 20, 21, "Our conversation is in heaven; FROM WHENCE also *we look* for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall *change our vile body*, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body," &c. Here is no ground for mistake or doubt. Paul was not expecting to go to heaven at death, nor at all; but he was looking for Christ to come *from heaven*—not when his vile body should go to corruption, but when the time should arrive for it to be fashioned like to Christ's glorious body, which is not till the resurrection. This is further confirmed by his language, in the same chapter, where he tells us how he labored and suffered, "If by any means I might *attain unto the resurrection of the dead:*" verse 11. How unlike is all this to the common idea of an entrance into heaven at death. The hope of Paul is thus distinctly stated; and it is the *gospel hope*, and demonstrates that modern christians are as ignorant of what that hope is as the pagans themselves. In fact, the theology of these days has substituted an *immortal soul* for or instead of Christ; and hence a hope of going to heaven at death instead of a future life by a resurrection from the dead, at the last day, as Christ has promised. A fatal mistake this, by which Christ is robbed and dishonored; while DEATH is crowned '*Prince of Peace,*' and as the *door* into heaven! Christ, however, declares himself to be THE DOOR, and affirms that those who climb up any other way are thieves and robbers. He is "the resurrection and the life;" without him, and without that resurrection which he has promised at the last day, there is no *gospel hope* of a future life or immortality. Let men beware how they attempt to approach the holy place into which Jesus our High Priest has entered. That is no part of the work of a Christian even to attempt an entrance into heaven at death, or any other period. Paul states again, 1 Thess. 1: 9, 10, what the work is that we have to do: "For they themselves show what manner of entering in we had unto you, and how ye turned to God from idols *to serve the living and true God;* and to WAIT *for his Son* FROM *heaven*, whom he raised from the dead," &c. Here the work of a Christian is distinctly stated: and it is no part of his business to be looking, expecting, or *hoping* to go to heaven at death. Let this be remembered.

To the Colossians Paul saith, "*When* Christ, who

is our life, *shall appear, then* shall ye also appear with him in glory:" not at death; but when Christ *returns "from* heaven;" it is then, and not till then, that he will appear *in glory.*

Once more. Paul, in writing to Titus, states clearly what is the *gospel hope,* and what is the work and duty of Christians in relation to it. Titus 2: 11, 13. Among the things which the grace of God teacheth is, "denying ungodliness and worldly lusts"—to "live soberly * * * in this present world"—*aioni,* age, or time—"looking for that *blessed hope,* and"—*kai,* even—"the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." Here we see what the *gospel hope* is. It is the return of Christ in his glory, at which time he will raise the saints who are dead and change the living ones, as Paul clearly states, 1 Thess. 4: 16, "For the Lord *himself* shall *descend from heaven* with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, with the trump of God: and *the dead in Christ shall rise first,*" &c.; also, 1 Corth. 15: 51, "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed in a moment * * * at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed," &c.

Thus Paul's testimony is uniform. It is the hope of eternal life, by a resurrection from the dead, at the return of our Lord Jesus Christ in his glory. If no resurrection, *no hope:* if no return of Christ in glory, *no resurrection;* then, all who have died are perished out of being, and will live no more forever. In all this there is nothing to sustain the fable of going to heaven at death. No—men must wait till our High Priest *comes out* of the holy place where he has entered; even out of heaven itself. If he never comes out, our hope is vain, and we perish.

We will now see if other Apostles are in agreement with Paul on this subject. 1 Peter 1: 3, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which, according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a *lively hope,*" or, *a hope of life,* an immortal life—"by THE RESURRECTION of Jesus Christ from the dead." Here we see the resurrection and the life subsequent to it; and dependent upon it, is the *gospel hope.* Following that, is "An inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you"—in the hands of him whom God raised up from the dead, and who, as our High Priest, has entered heaven, or the holy place. In his hands is the inheritance *reserved,* "ready to be *revealed* in the last time:" in *the hope* of which Peter saith, "Ye greatly rejoice, though now for a season, if need be, ye are in heaviness * * * that the trial of your faith * * * might be found unto praise, and honor and glory *at the appearing of Jesus Christ:*" i. e., when he shall come out of the holy place, or *from heaven.* Peter adds, v. 13, "Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and *hope* to the end for the grace"—*favor*—"that is to be brought unto you at" [*death?* No, but at] "*the revelation* of Jesus Christ." Thus we see to what the *gospel hope* has reference, and when it is to be realized: not at death, but at the return of Christ from heaven. So again Peter expresses this matter clearly, in Acts 3: 20, where he saith, God "shall send Jesus Christ * * * whom the heavens must receive, [or retain] until the times of restitution of all things which God hath spoken," &c. Thus, turn which way we will, the great truth, that the *gospel hope* is "*the return of Christ from heaven and the resurrection of the dead,*" meets us in full view. Alas, that men should turn off their eyes from it to deify death, and steal a march to heaven by means of the King of Terrors!

Let us turn to one more witness on this subject. 1 John 3: 2, 3, "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when" [we die? No, but when] "*he shall appear,* we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is." Surely, we shall not be like him at death; for he has his resurrection and glorious *body.* Death, then, is not the point of time John speaks of. No—it is when he shall appear—when he comes out of the holy of holies, "*from* heaven:" that is the *gospel hope;* and John adds, "Every man that hath THIS HOPE in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure;" that is the effect of this hope; its tendency is to promote holiness. Such is the character and influence of the hope of the gospel. Let all remember this truth, and lay it to heart. Men professing the hope of the gospel, who are not made Christlike by it, have reason to call in question the reality of their hope. If we hold the hope, we have been speaking of in *theory,* the greater will be our guilt if we do not let it have its *practical* result on our hearts and lives. Again, we repeat the apostolic affirmation—"*Every man* that hath *this* hope in him *purifieth himself* EVEN as he"—Christ—"is pure." No other standard will answer. How much reason have we to bewail our past short-comings. Let us haste to God, through our High Priest, while he is yet in the holy of holies, for that mercy which shall blot out our past sins, and enable us for time to come to walk as Christ also walked: that when he shall appear—come out of the holy place—we may meet him with joy, and receive the crown of life.

———o———

STORRS' MISCELLANY.—We have added to this work "*The True Source of Life,*" and shall hereafter sell it at 50 cents; which is as low as it can be afforded. It now contains over 280 pages neatly bound in muslin. The statement of its number of pages in the last Examiner, was an error.

———o———

OUR SUBSCRIBERS, who have paid for the Examiner the year now closed, and have failed to receive any number, if they will inform us free of expense, we will forward the missing ones without charge.

FROM H. L. HASTINGS.

*Plymouth, Mass.*

BR. STORRS:—We have got the stirring stick into this old stagnant pool. We have large congregations. Sundays a crowd, and Sunday nights a perfect *jam* long before meeting time. Then a great many can't get in the house. Ministers preach on the State of the Dead—Church-members cry Infidelity! Heresy! &c., &c. God speed the right! Amen! Some have been baptised and some converted, &c.

I almost envied you your visit to Honeoye. "O! I long to be *there*." That is *about* the best spot I ever saw on this old world.

## "ASBESTOS"—UNQUENCHABLE.

MATT. III. 12.—"But he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire."

This is spoken of Christ by John the Baptist. By referring to the Saviour's discourse, recorded in Mark ix., we learn that it is in hell, or *Gehenna*, that wicked men were to be cast, "where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched." This is one of the most fearful denunciations recorded in the book of God. The unbelievers shall be consumed, burnt up in *Gehenna*, by unquenchable fire. It has been argued, or rather inferred, from this passage, that the *torment* of the wicked must necessarily be eternal in its duration. To this it may be replied that instances may be produced, as Ezek. 20: 47, where the expression indicates not that the things to be destroyed shall be forever preserved, but that nothing would deliver from the fierceness of the flame, and consequently everything submitted to its action would be consumed.

That this is the idea conveyed by the phrase "unquenchable fire," I will now proceed to demonstrate. The Greek words found in Matt. 3: 12, rendered "unquenchable fire," are *puri asbesto.*

Eusebus, who is supposed to have been born at Cesaræa, A. D. 267, and of which city he became Bishop in 315, in his history of the Christian Church, which has gained for him the title of the Father of Ecclesiastical History, gives an account of the martyrdom of such of of the saints as had suffered death for the gospel's sake, In his history, book vi., ch. 41, he gives an account of those who were martyred at Alexandria. He speaks of them as follows: "The first of these was Julian, a man afflicted with the gout, neither able to walk nor stand, who, with two others that carried him, was arraigned. Of these, the one immediately denied, but the other, named Cronion, surnamed Eunus, and the aged Julian himself, having confessed the Lord, was carried on camels throughout the city—a very large one as you know—and in this elevation were scourged, and finally consumed in an *immense fire*, (*puri asbesto.*) After these, Epimachus and Alexander, who had continued for a long time in prison, enduring innumerable suffering from the scourges and scrapers, were also destroyed in an *immense fire*," (*puri asbesto.*)

Here, then, we have the same phrase that is used in the bible, used by a learned and eloquent Christian Bishop only about three hundred years after Christ; and no reader can be at loss to understand its import in the connection. No one can fail to see that the expression "unquenchable fire" affords no support to the common theory of eternal torment—but instead of that it is used to denote a fire that utterly consumes whatever is submitted to its action. If the expression *puri asbesto* proves that the wicked will be tormented eternally, then Eusebus taught that the martyrs had been tormented eternally. If Eusebus taught that the martyrs were burned to ashes, then John the Baptist and Jesus Christ declared that the wicked men should be thus burned in Ge-enna.

H. L. H.

## "THE MAN OF SIN."

BR. STORRS:—I have been perusing your excellent paper with much profit, and knowing that to err is common with all men, therefore I trust you will not be offended with me if I should differ with you on some points. I have reference to an article written by yourself, in vol. 6, page 57, of the Examiner, headed "Mysterious Rappings"—"The Man of Sin," or 2 Thess. 2: 1 to 12 considered. This subject is one of vast importance—therefore a right understanding of it is very essential. I am persuaded that the man of sin here spoken of is not the devil, but is the Papacy. You object to its being the Papacy because you think it does not answer the description given by Paul where he said, "He (the man of sin) would exalt himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped. I would ask, did he not go beyond, or exalt his power or himself above what God or the Virgin Mary, or any other being ever did, when he declared he had power to forgive sins in advance, (that is, before committed,) and that, too, for gold and silver? When God has declared that without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins; and this remission comes only through faith in his (Christ's) name. I think he has by far outstripped all that is called God, or that is worshipped; and therefore fills perfectly the description given by Paul; and Daniel's description, I think, agrees with Paul's, as given in the 7th chapter, where he speaks of the little horn that should speak great words against the Most High, (or contrary to the teaching of the Most High,) and I suppose no one doubts that the little horn represents the Papacy. Mark—Paul said this man of sin was to *consume*, and finally be destroyed. Daniel said they s ould take away his dominion, to *consume* and finally destroy it, showing the consuming process in both cases.

Another objection, you say, is, that the revelation of the man of sin is to be a sure sign that the day of

the Lord was impending, or had come. I think it is one of the signs given, but not the *last* one, or the one that was immediately to go before Christ's coming. Your mistake here arises from your not observing the difference between the man of sin and the working of Satan, which are two distinct powers, or manifestations. You say the coming of the man of sin is after the working of Satan. This is a great mistake, I think. Look again at the 8th and 9th verses in connection; and remember that it would be folly to talk of the coming of Satan, for he has not left his kingdom, or gone from this ungodly world since he told the Lord he was going to and fro in the earth, (mark that,) and walking up and down in it. Job 1: 7. I have nowhere seen any account of his going away, or any evidence from the actions of mankind that he was gone; therefore I do not look for his coming, for that would imply that he had left or gone away. But Christ is gone, and is coming again, (praise the Lord,) and his coming is to be after the working of Satan; and Paul said he (Christ) should destroy the man of sin by the brightness of his coming, whose coming (referring back to what he had just said of Christ's coming,) is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish, because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved. And for this cause, God shall send them strong delusions, that they should believe a lie, that they might be damned who had pleasure in unrighteousness. We need not a philosopher to point us to this working of Satan; for all that have been acquainted with the Rapping Spirits, have seen this power or working of Satan, whether they believe it or not. May the Lord help his dear children to arouse themselves and see to it; that the devil does not deceive them by his devices; but let us watch and be sober, knowing that our adversary the devil goeth about as a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour, whom resist steadfast unto the end. Thus we see we are brought to the last of a series of events that is to transpire before Christ comes. May God keep us by his power safe from all harm is my desire and prayer. Now I have given you my views on this all-important subject. Pardon me if I have erred in judgment, for it is the truth I seek above all else. URIAL FINN.

*Geneva, N. Y.*, Nov., 1851.

---

## GOD'S HOUSE OF WORSHIP.

The worship of God in his house has constituted a part of what he has required of mankind in all ages. This is one of the ends for which the Sabbath was instituted. We are not to forsake the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is. But the state of mind which we are to possess in the house of religious worship is more especially the point now before us.

It is said of Whitfield, that on one occasion, when he was about to preach, he went into his closet for prayer. The congregation assembled, and waited till they became impatient, and sent a messenger after him. He went in a very still manner to the study door, and heard Whitfield's voice in prayer in nearly the following language:

O Lord, grant me more of thy Holy Spirit. I cannot preach, blessed God, without more of thy Spirit. The messenger interrupted him in his devotions, but was told by Mr. Whitfield that he could not go without more of God in his soul. He returned to the congregation, saying that Mr. Whitfield would be there soon. Presently Whitfield entered the door with his face shining as did Moses' when he came down from the Mount. And oh, with what power he preached! The whole house was shaken by God's almighty power. And this I apprehend was the great secret of his success in the ministry—God was with him.

Now, if every minister and all the people were to resort to the house of God from earnest, humble, closet devotions, what displays of God's grace would be witnessed in his temple every time they might meet.

But is it not true with reference to some, both saints and sinners, that they do not habitually attend religious worship in God's house. Sometimes a little cold or heat, or drowsiness, or rain, will keep people away from the house of God. If these things were to keep them from their ordinary business on a week day, then there would be some manner of excuse for them, but as they do not, no excuse of this kind can be offered: Some likewise are in the habit of entering God's house after the service has commenced, a custom by no means justifiable, and what is the consequence? Why, such lose, perhaps, the most important part of the public worship of God, viz: the reading the Scriptures, which are able to make us wise unto eternal life.

But this is not all. They disturb the minister and the congregation: for it is seldom that a man enters God's house of worship after the services have commenced, without his being particularly noticed by most of the people present, and some must turn their bodies half around, or at least their heads, to gratify their curiosity.

But I have reference not merely to the Sabbath and meetings for preaching, but to prayer and other meetings during the week. Many think it too much of a task to attend religious meetings, except on the Sabbath, and not even then unless there is to be good preaching.

The prayer meeting properly sustained is the life of Christian society. And yet how many say, when a meeting of this kind is appointed, it is nothing but a prayer meeting—that is all. But that is enough. And those who have not a relish for the prayer and conference meetings, are greatly deficient in vital piety, and discourage their minister and brethren who habitually attend these meetings. The Jews evidently spent about half their time in external religious devotions. And, though they were exceedingly deficient in spirituality, yet no nation ever prospered more, in a pecuniary sense, than did the Jews. The monthly covenant meeting, the preparatory lecture, the class meeting, and meetings for fasting and prayer, occasionally, are all highly important and clearly enjoined upon us by our covenant vows, for many of us have pledged ourselves to attend both the occasional and stated meetings of the different churches and societies to which we belong. Even the impenitent should not excuse themselves from attending those meetings under ordinary circumstances. Because religion should be attended to above all else, for it is infinitely more important for all.

## BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, TRACTS, &c. FOR SALE AT BIBLE EXAMINER OFFICE.

The Postage on all these works we have to *prepay* when sent by mail. That amount must be added to the price by all who order them sent in that way. The postage is *one cent* for *each* ounce, or a fraction of an ounce, for any distance under 500 miles: over 500 and under 1500, two cents: over 1500 and under 2500, three cents. We affix the weight to each work, that all may see what the postage is, and send accordingly:

1. "SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT, by H. H. Dobney," Baptist Minister; an argument in *two parts*. This is a work of great power, showing the *Righteous only will live Forever*. 286 pages, 12mo. Price 37½ cts in paper covers. Weight 9 oz.

2. "DOBNEY ABRIDGED."—Or, the *Second Part* of the Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment, in an edition by itself. It contains all that is really essential in the controversy, to enable the reader to decide whether *endless torture*, or *destruction of being*, is the true teaching of Scripture. We put it at the extremely low price of 25 cents. Weight 8 oz.

3. "DIALOGUES ON FUTURE PUNISHMENT, by Rev. Wm. Glen Moncrieff," Scotland. A pamphlet of 60 pages, 12mo. It is a familiar examination of the question of Immortality conducted in a spirit that cannot fail to interest. Price 15 cents. Weight 3 oz.

4. "THE UNITY OF MAN, OR LIFE AND DEATH REALITIES. A Reply to Rev. Luther Lee, by Anthropos." This is a thorough refutation of Mr. Lee's position of the natural immortality of man. Price 15 cents. Weight 3 oz.

5. "SIX SERMONS, by George Storrs. An inquiry, *Are the Wicked Immortal?*" To which is *added* a dissertation on the "State of the Dead;" and *prefixed* Archbishop Whately's remarks on "The Second Death." Price 15 cts. Weight 3 oz.

6. "CAN YOU BELIEVE? By Wm. Glen Moncrieff," Scotland. A tract of four pages, showing the absurdity of the notion of immortality in sin and suffering. Price 30 cents per hundred.

7. "SECOND DEATH, by Archbishop Whately." A Tract of 8 pages. Price 60 cents per hundred.

8. "THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS." A Tract of 12 pages. Price 75 cents per 100.

9. "THE TWO THRONES, Or, The Throne of God and the Throne of Christ. By George Storrs." This tract goes to show the present position of Christ, and what it will be in the Age to come. Price 2 cents.

10. "TRUE SOURCE OF LIFE, by George Storrs." A Tract of 12 pages. Price $1 per 100.

Of the Tracts it takes about 40 pages to make one ounce.

11. STORRS' MISCELLANY." New edition. It contains the foregoing Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, & 10, bound in 1 vol. Price 50c. Wt. 9oz.

12. "THE IMMATERIALITY OF THE SOUL, or, Man entirely dependant upon his organization for all his mental and moral powers: By Thomas Read, New York." Price 7 cts. Wt. 1 oz.

13. "OUR ISRAELITISH ORIGIN, or Lectures on Ancient Israel, by J. Wilson," England. This work is designed to show that the modern inhabitants of Europe, and the people of the United States, are the literal descendants of Jacob, and of the lost tribes of Israel. Price 75 cents bound, or 50 in paper covers. Weight, bound, 14 oz.; in paper. 9 oz.

14. "TRUTH AGAINST FICTION," or the three last chapters of Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment. Price 12c. Wt. 2 oz.

On all the foregoing works, one-third discount will be allowed to those who buy to sell again; but in all cases the purchaser *must* add to the price the amount of postage, if ordered by mail.

15. "BIBLE EXAMINER, EXTRA." New Edition. It contains Bishop Whately's remarks on "Second Death"—"Endless Misery," by Bishop Newton—Our "Six Sermons," &c. 16 pages, quarto, and sold at the extreme low price of $2.50 per 100, or 5 cents single copy. Weight 2 oz.

16. "BIBLE EXAMINER" for '48 and '49, bound in one volume. Price $1.50. No discount.

17. "BIBLE EXAMINER" for '50 & 51, bound in 1 vol. Price $1.50. 25 cts. off to paying subscribers for '52, if ordered soon.

All orders must be addressed GEO. STORRS, Philada, Pa.

## INDEX TO VOL. VI.


All Soul, - - - - - - - 40
Asleep in Jesus, - - - - - - 41
Acrostics, - - - - - - 96, 160
Ages to Come—Editor, - - - - - 120
Asbestos—Unquenchable, - - - - 190
Bible Truth, - - - - - - 48
Books—Catalogue of - - - - - 112
Blain, Eld. Jacob, - - - - - 137,143
Beauties of Immortal-Soulism, - - - - 152
Christ Died—Read, - - - - - 118,129
Demonology, - - - - - - 10
Dobney's Letters, - - - - - 24,73
Dialogues—Moncrieff, - - - - - 44
Danger and Remedy—English Tracts, - - 86
Debate—Litch and Read, - - - - 170
Death Defined by J. Litch, - - - - 173
Debate—Synopsis of, - - - - - 173
Election, - - - - - - 29
End of the Wicked—C. Fitch, - - - - 54
Extracts, &c., by Stephens, K. C. B., - - - 143
Eternity of Eternities, - - - - - 172
Eternal Punishment, - - - - - 172
Endless Misery—John Foster, England, - - 177
Future State—Courtenay. - - - - 99,145
First Principles—Editor, - - - - 137
Gospel Hope, - - - - - - 185
God's House of Worship—Selected, - - - 191
History of Spirit-Rappings - - - - 41
Immortality—A Tract, - - - - - 62
" Eternal Life—Moncrieff, - - - 65
Immortality—C. Fitch, - - - - - 77
Immortality of the Soul—Selected, - - - 84
Is Man Immortal?—Frisbie, - - - - 132
Inquiries by a Hearer, - - - - - 142
Immortality—Lewis Butler, - - - - - 166
Kingdom of God—Editor, - - - - - 5
Lord against Dobney, - - - - - 17
Life in Christ—White, - - - 37,52,70,81,98,115,147
Loss When a Soul is Lost, - - - - 168
Mysterious Rappings, - - - - 8,26,42,57,123
Misrepresentation Corrected, - - - - 127
Man's Spirit—Nature of—Read, - - - 164, 183
Man of Sin—Finn, - - - - - 190
Noble Stand—C. M. Richmond, - - - 63
Nomenclatory, - - - - - - 93
Pope Gregory, - - - - - - 46
Postage Law, - - - - - - 107,112
Pneumatologist—T. Smith and Editor, - - - 121
Paul's Testimony—A Sermon, - - - - 157
Remarks on Eccl. 9: 4, 5, - - - - 57
" 1 Corth. 15: 22, - - - - - 89
Saviour's Promise of Life—Moncrieff, - - - 14
Sunderland's Belief, - - - - - 43
Soul or Body—True Wesleyan, - - - - 56
Scripture Exposition—Editor, - - - 60,125,140,174
Spirit Rappers, - - - - - - 88
Signs of Antichrist, - - - - - 108
State of the Dead—Moncrieff, - - - 106,113,133
True Source of Immortality—Read, - 1,30,33,49,102
Thoughts on Luke, 9: 23–26. - - - - 75
True Source of Life—Editor, - - - - 90
Take Care to get on the Right Boat, - - - 93
Tabernacle of David—Editor, - - - - 139
Times of Restitution—Editor— - - - 139
True Literalism—Editor, - - - - 149
Tour to the Northwest—Editor, - - - 152
Tate's, Eld. John, Defence, - - - - 161.181
Work Progresses, - - - - - - 47
What Does it Mean? - - - - - 89
White's Letter, - - - - - - 105